National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XVI. NO. 47. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1856. WHOLE NO. 827.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, 138 *Nassau St., New York,*

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

31 *North Fifth St., Philadelphia.*

Advertisements inserted at $1 per square for the first insertion, and 25 cents for every subsequent one. For advertisements less than a square, 50 cents for each insertion.

Selections.

CALL FOR A NATIONAL NOMINATING CONVENTION.

To the Abolitionists of the United States:

OUR undertaking is the abolition of American Slavery, every part and parcel of it. To this undertaking we are prompted by impartial love for the white man and the black man, for the slaveholder and the slave, and by supreme love for Him, who gave His Son to die for all men, because He loved all men.

The means we employ are moral and political. They are prayer to God and argument with man, and votes that agree with, and give effect to prayer and argument.

Another Presidential election is approaching. Can we rely on any of the great parties of our country to do our work in that election? ON NONE OF THEM. NONE OF THEM GO FOR THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY. Only one of them is so much as anti-slavery; and even that one is anti-slavery at but a single point. The Republican party opposes the introduction of slavery into the Territories, but endorses its constitutionality in all the slave States.* It lets alone the whole slave trade, not only that between the States, but the coastwise trade also, which is carried on under the sanction and regulations of Congress. It lets alone slavery in the District of Columbia. It even lets alone the Fugitive Slave Bill, and well it may, for it fully admits that all the States, and does not deny that all the Territories, also, are the constitutional hunting-ground for slaves. The Republican party would have Kansas a free State. Nevertheless, it would allow the slaveholder a safe pursuit over all its prairies and through all its towns after his bleeding and broken-hearted fugitives.

We need not have said all this to prove that we have no right to rely on the Republican party to do our work in the coming election. Enough to this end is the fact that it is not an Abolition party, and that we are Abolitionists. Enough to this end is the fact that the slavery which we are trying to abolish this party spreads its wing over, and denies our right to abolish. Enough to this end is it that whilst we hold slavery to be a preëminent piracy and a naked outlaw, and that the Constitution not only does not, but could not legalize it, this party, on the contrary, regards our endeavour to liberate the millions of slaves as a war upon the Constitution and a violation of law.

Let it not be supposed that we undervalue the character of the members of the Republican party. Not a few of them are our personal friends—esteemed and beloved by us. A considerable portion of them, we trust, are Abolitionists at heart, and subscribe to our principles. But the more excellent the character of the members of this party, the more injurious the false policy which they have suffered to be stamped upon the party. That such men should make such concessions to slavery, is lamentable indeed. Alas, for Freedom, when even her own professed friends can consent to yield so much to slavery, in exchange for so little for freedom!

Is it said that policy dictates the adoption of a platform on which all can stand who are opposed to the extension of slavery, be the degree or character of their opposition what it may? And is it argued and expected that the Republican party, though starting on the low ground of this policy, will rise into an Abolition party? We answer that such a policy will, from its own inevitable influence, keep down and drag down the party that adopts it. Hence, should the Republican party get the reins of government, it will endeavour to satisfy the nation by restoring the Missouri Compromise, and acquiescing, at every other point, in the present possessions and practices of slavery. It would feel itself bound, by the implications of its platform, not to disturb those possessions and practices. Thousands in the Republican party mean that it shall work the overthrow of slavery, and doubtless many a slaveholder fears this result. Nevertheless, the success of the Republican party may prove the confirmation rather than the subversion of slavery, the most authoritative and effective endorsement of slavery, because endorsed by anti-slavery men.

It is manifest, then, that we, who refuse all concessions to slavery, and all terms with whatever piracy, must lay our account with doing our own work in this election. We must nominate our candidates and vote for them, and do what we can to persuade others to vote for them. Why should we despair of electing them? Mighty will be the appeal of our principles to all who love justice and liberty for all. In their bosoms the motto of the Republican party, "Slavery sectional—liberty national," can awaken no enthusiasm, and call up no response. The words that tell our truthful, glorious, heavenly principle, "SLAVERY FOR NONE—LIBERTY FOR ALL"—these are the words that have power to unlock their hearts and enlist their sympathies, and fire their zeal. Thousands may come to us who would never consent to go to them. Thousands may desert their standard to gather around ours. Why, indeed, should not the whole Republican party do this? The comparatively little good for which it goes, we go for also. And should they refrain from coming to us, because, in addition to this, we go for other and immeasurably greater good? Think us not extravagant when we say that it is far from improbable that the Republican party will come to our standard. Another great outrage at the hands of the Slave Power—such as the slaughter of a hundred men in Kansas—and there will quickly be but two political parties in the nation—one party to kill slavery, and another to save it. A party to abolish slavery and a party to defend it will be the only political parties for which we shall then have room—or for which we shall then have the least demand. This was virtually admitted by Abijah Mann when, amid the loud applause of the Pittsburg Convention, he said:

"If the Government proceed to the shedding of a single drop of blood, for the purpose of having the infamous laws of the Border Ruffian Legislature enforced, I give it to you as my deliberate conviction, and on my responsibility as a citizen, that it will be the end of human slavery in this land."

In such an event, what room would there be for the Republican party, with its distinct admission that "the slaveholding interest, in the States where it exists, is entitled, under the Constitution, like all other local interests, to immunity from the interferences of the General Government"? In such an event, what room would there be for the Republican party, a party "disclaiming any intentions to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists."† In such an event, what room would there be for the Republican party, whose Convention referred to was presided over by a slaveholder, representing a slaveholding constituency, and bringing with him, as he himself stated, a "Southern platform," designed, as he himself stated, to restore the Missouri Compromise as "the security of the slave institution";‡ a party that, like the Janus-faced Colonization Society, has its pro-slavery appeal for the South, and its anti-slavery appeal for the North—a party in which slaveholders and anti-slavery men are to unite for the common object of a mutual compromise that shall be "the finale of all existing commotions," and that shall nevertheless leave the slave in his chains!§

We must not, however, concern ourselves inordinately with the question, whether there will be few or many to come to us. We should find sufficient encouragement to go forward in the assurance that God is with us. In claiming, as we do, the immediate and unconditional liberation of every slave, and in denying, as we do, the possibility of law for slavery, we cannot doubt that we have the Divine approbation and the Divine blessing.

Meet with us, then, brethren, at Syracuse, on Wednesday, the 28th day of next May, for the purpose of nominating men, for President and Vice-President of the United States, who have the ability, the integrity, and the courage to assert their principles, and who will wield their official powers for the deliverance of every American slave, for the deliverance of every American slaveholder, and for the salvation of the whole country. We confess that we expect to see great numbers of you on that occasion. We confess, too, that we should expect to see still greater numbers of you but for our apprehension that most of you are still in the habit of looking to others than Abolitionists, and waiting for other than Abolitionists, to do your work. In 1848 you must wait to see what the Buffalo platform party would do. It did nothing but die. In 1852 you must wait to see what the Pittsburg platform party would do. That, too, did nothing but die. And, now, will you wait to see what the second Pittsburg platform party will do? That is just as sure to die as were the others. At its very birth it refuses to inscribe on its banner the motto of its predecessors, "No more Slave States," and rallies, in company with slaveholders, on the one issue of restoring the infamous Missouri Compromise, in which Freedom was betrayed, the Slave Power enthroned, and its career of successful aggression inaugurated.

Every anti-slavery party that does not rise to the level of an Abolition party is without root and must wither away. To expect success for this new Pittsburg party—for this policy of stopping the progress of slavery at one point, whilst indorsing and guaranteeing the great mass of it—is scarcely less folly than to expect to save the city by an attempt to stay the flames at one point, whilst the incendiaries are permitted to fan the flames at every other.

March, 1856.

[Signed by GERRIT SMITH and many others.]

** See Address of Pittsburg Convention.*
† See Address of Pittsburg Convention.
‡ See Southern Platform, by F. P. Blair.
§ See Southern Platform, &c.

BIBLES AND RIFLES IN KANSAS.

THE REV. H. W. BEECHER TO THE NEW HAVEN COLONY FOR KANSAS.

BROOKLYN, Friday, March, 28, 1856.

C. B. Lines, Esq., New Haven, Conn.

DEAR SIR: Allow me to address you, and, through you, the gentlemen of your Company, on the eve of your departure for Kansas. I hope and believe that you will find a settlement there to be a means of great personal prosperity. You are not, like the early settlers of New Haven, going upon a doubtful enterprise, to a poor soil, in a severe climate, the ocean on one side and the wilderness of a Continent on every other side. You will not go far from us. In our day we measure by time, rather than distance, by hours, not miles. You will not be as far from your old homes as one Sabbath is from another. And yet you go upon an errand not one *whit* less Christian and less heroic than that of our common ancestors, who founded New Haven. You are pioneers of towns and cities; you are the seed of Christianity—the germs of civilization. You will put down your feet in a wilderness; in a year it will be a populous place. And where the morning sun now rises upon herds of wild buffalo, couched deep in wild grass, in your own life time it will bring forth the cry of multitudes and the noise of a city. Nevertheless such perils have been coiled about the young State of Kansas that it is an act of courage to settle there, if a man goes with the true spirit of American Institutions. To go there determined to transplant to its soil that tree of liberty which, under God, has in older States borne and shook down from its boughs all the fruits of an unparalleled prosperity, requires heroic courage. It is a pleasure and honour to us to be in any way connected with such an enterprise, by furnishing to the emigrant material or moral aid. I have personally felt a double interest in your company, because it springs from New Haven, my father's birth-place and home of my ancestors. A friend and parishioner (A. Studwell) desires me to present to you twenty-five copies of the Bible. This is the charter of all charters, the constitution of all constitutions, the source and spring of Christian manliness. This book will be at the foundation of your State. It will teach you to value your rights, and inspire you to defend them. The donor has caused to be inscribed upon them: "Be ye steadfast and unmoveable." It is a shame that, in America, amidst our free institiutions, anything else should be needed but *moral* instrumentalities. But you do need more. You will be surrounded by men who have already committed the wickedest wrongs, and the most atrocious crimes. They will scruple at nothing by which slavery may be fastened upon the young State. To send forth companies of men with their families amid those who have been bred to regard helplessness as a lawful prey to strength would be a piece of unjustifiable cruelty. I send to you, therefore, as I promised, the arms required for twenty-five men. I have not the least fear that a hundred men bred under New England influences will be too eager or too warlike. You have been taught to create wealth and not to rob it; to rely upon intelligence and rectitude for defence. And you will not be in any danger of erring on the side of violence. But you are sent for the defence of great rights. You have no liberty to betray them by cowardice. There are times when self-defence is a religious duty. If that duty was ever imperative, it is now, and in Kansas. I do not say that you have barely the right to defend yourselves and your liberties; I say that it is a duty from which you cannot shrink without leaving your honour, your manhood, your Christian fidelity, behind you. But this invincible courage will be a shield to you. You will not need to use arms when it is known that you have them, and are determined to employ them in extremities. It is the very essence of that spirit which slavery breeds to be arrogant toward the weak, and cowardly before the strong. If you are willing to lose your lives, you will save them. If, on the other hand, you are found helpless, the miscreants of slavery would sweep you from Kansas like grass on the prairies before Autumnal fires. If you are known to be fearless men, prepared for emergencies, slavery, like a lion, will come up, and, gazing into the eyes of courrageous men, will stop, cower and creep away into ambush. I trust that the perils which, a few months ago, hung like a cloud over that fair State are lifting and passing away. May you find an unobstructed peace! *Then,* let these arms hang above your doors, as the old revolutionary muskets do in many a New England dwelling. May your children, in another generation, look upon them with pride and say, Our father's courage saved this fair region from blood and slavery. We will not forget you. Every morning's breeze shall catch the blessings of our prayers and roll them westward to your prairie homes. May your sons be large-hearted as the Heavens above their heads; may your daughters fill the land as the flowers do the prairies, only sweeter and fairer than they.

I am, in the bonds of the Gospel and in the firm faith of Liberty, truly yours, H. W. BEECHER.

THE KANSAS COLONY TO MR. BEECHER.

NEW HAVEN, Monday, March 31, 1856.

THE REV. H. W. BEECHER—*Dear Sir:* Your note of the 29th inst. is just received, together with the box of Bibles and the amount promised for "Weapons of Defence"—all for the use and benefit of our Kansas Colony.

The responsibilities connected with our enterprise, together with numerous cares and anxieties of a more private nature, press so heavily upon me that I am utterly unfitted to respond to your letter in a manner at all suited to my own feelings or the circumstances of the case. I can only say that we gratefully accept the Bibles as the only sure foundation on which to erect *Free Institutions,* and the *sole basis* of a *pure Christian,* and, of course, well suited to meet the earliest wants of our Prairie House. We ask no better "Charter" for our liberties than can be found upon its pages—no "Constitution" as the basis of our social fabric that does not derive its character and vitality from the pure and holy principles of the Bible. Upon this rock we design to rear our infant *Colony,* and by so doing feel the strongest confidence that He whose power controls will smile upon us until, in that vast wilderness, there shall be another point of communication between earth and heaven, the voice of prayer and songs of praise ascending to the throne of God, and in return countless blessings descending upon the people. We hope also that from this settlement will go out an influence for good over the State that shall be to some extent *felt* in promoting civil order, just and equal laws, a correct idea of the rights of man, and the value of Free Institutions. But, in the judgment of a large majority of our people, there are always circumstances connected with the founding of new States that render it wise and proper, even for peaceable Christian men, while they rely upon the providence of God for protection, to provide themselves also with the means of rendering such aid avoidable. We rely upon God for a crop of corn, but only in connection with breaking up the prairie and sowing the seed. Our fathers came to this land *emphatically* as religious, and yet they brought with them "Weapons of Defence," and they found use for them, and it does not yet appear that any of the conservative pro-slavery journals in our Northern cities have discovered any "treason" in their conduct. Recent events have shown that emigration to Kansas, in this enlightened age and country has been attended by circumstances clearly indicating that there is not even here exemption from the common necessity. We, therefore, accept the weapons also, and, like our fathers, we go with the Bible to indicate the peaceful nature of our mission, and the harmless character of our company, and a weapon to teach those who may be disposed to molest us (if any such there be) that while we determine to do only that which is right, we will not submit tamely to that which is wrong. We wish, nevertheless, to have it distinctly understood that we do not anticipate the occurrence of any contingency that will render it necessary to use these deadly weapons for our protection, and that they cannot be so used while in our hands, except in the *last resort,* and for the defence of those rights and liberties that are dearer than life itself. It only remains for me to tender to you, and, through you, to those who have cooperated with you in these manifestations of sympathy with our enterprise, our sincere thanks.

In great haste, yours truly, C. B. LINES,
In behalf of the Company.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE QUESTION.

From The Liberator.

* * * The reason why we feel impelled to take up this question, at this crisis, is because it *is* "a time of public need"; because the alarming situation of the Kansas settlers is urged as demonstrating the worthlessness of the principles of peace; because moral suasion, returning good for evil, the martyr-spirit, are all derided as folly and madness as against "border-ruffianism"; because the jesuitical doctrine, that "the end sanctifies the means," is warmly espoused by Protestant evangelical teachers; and because the use of murderous weapons, in defence of imperilled rights, is vindicated as the highest duty by men like Ward Beecher, Theodore Parker and Gerrit Smith, who wield a tremendous influence over the popular mind, and to whom tens of thousands of admiring and confiding followers look up with an almost absolute trust in all matters pertaining to moral duty. When such eminent reformers err, and seek to carry the land with them, evil is done on a colossal scale, however laudable may be their object, pure their motive, or sincere their belief. Whether they are in error, in advocating resistance of evil-doers unto death, every one must decide for himself, because "to his own master he stands or falls"; but, conscientiously believing that they are acting upon a false principle in this matter, and seeing them making use of a trying emergency to give it popular eclat, we cannot be dumb, and at the same time true to our convictions of duty. Gerrit Smith's theory of "righteous civil government" does not appear to have changed him for the better on the subject of peace. He has recently contributed some four or five thousand dollars—a generous sum—towards the purchase of Sharp's rifles, and other "necessaries"—an amount of money greatly needed to carry on the work of moral persuasion for the abolition of slavery throughout the land, by which more could be done to effect the desired change in public sentiment than by the purchase of every rifle in the Empire State. We recollect that when the Non-Resistance Society was organized, he wrote us a letter, stating that he believed Christ was a non-resistant; that the Gospel inculcated non-resistance; that Christians, therefore, should possess that spirit; but expressing distrust of his own goodness to that extent, and he hence shrunk from making a public profession. From the heartiness and liberality with which he enters into the multiplication of Sharp's rifles at this time, we are led to conclude that he has changed his views of Christ and Christianity, respecting the treatment of enemies; and so is acting up to his own standard. We have no censure to bestow, but only regret to express.

Mr. Beecher says—"We know that there are those who will scoff at the idea of holding a sword or a rifle, in a Christian state of mind." He will allow us to shrink from such an idea without scoffing. We know not where to look for Christianity, if not to its founder; and, taking the record of his life and death, of his teaching and example, we can discover nothing which even remotely, under any conceivable circumstances, justifies the use of the sword or rifle, on the part of his followers; on the contrary, we find nothing but self-sacrifice, willing martyrdom (if need be), peace and good will, and the prohibition of all retaliatory feelings, enjoined upon all who would be his disciples. When he said, "Fear not those who kill the body," he broke every deadly weapon. When he said, "My kingdom is not of this world, else would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews," he plainly prohibited war in self-defence, and substituted martyrdom therefor. When he said, "Love your enemies," he did not mean "Kill them, if they go too far." When he said, while expiring on the cross, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do," he did not treat them as "a herd of buffaloes," but as poor misguided and lost men. We believe in his philosophy; we accept his instruction; we are thrilled by his example; we rejoice in his fidelity. How touching is the language of James! "Ye have condemned and killed THE JUST; and *he doth not resist you.*" And how melting to the soul is the declaration, "He was led as a lamb to the slaughter"! And again: "God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

Now we submit whether, as a professed minister of Christ, Mr. Beecher was acting consistently in playing the auctioneer, last week, in the Rev. Mr. Dutton's church at New Haven, in order to raise a certain number of Sharp's rifles, for the use of emigrants to Kansas. Further—whether he exhibited a Christian spirit in facetiously adding, when a Mr. Killam had pledged one rifle—"*Killam!* that's a significant name in connection with a Sharp's rifle!" and thus "bringing down the house." Is the slaughter of our fellow-creatures, however debased, to be turned into a joke, and to be made a subject of *Christian* merriment? Will no evil come of this? Where are the friends of peace, that they are not bearing their testimony against such proceedings? Will any plead, that to do so will be giving aid and comfort to "border ruffianism," and discouraging the friends of freedom in Kansas—therefore, silence is now the wisest policy? It is a specious plea, and indicates a distrust of truth. Silence is comparatively pardonable, if only military men were drumming up for recruits, because this would be acting in character, and they would not be very likely to unsettle the views of such as have been growing more pacific; but when the most widely beloved, and honoured, and influential, among the reformers of the age, pursue a course like this, and seek to indoctrinate the people with warlike sentiments, it is specially important, though their aim is liberty, that every believer in the peace doctrine should "cry aloud and spare not." Let us respect those who are true to themselves, in furnishing arms to be used in defence of the right; but let us be equally true, as the friends of peace, to the convictions we cherish as to the inviolability of human life.

What are the facts respecting Kansas? Briefly these: "Squatter Sovereignty" has turned out to be repeated invasions of the Territory by armed bandits from Missouri, who have successfully made it a conquered province, manufactured a territorial government, enacted a code of laws worthy of pandemonium, and trampled the civil and political rights of the *bona fide* settlers under their feet; and for one sole object—to make Kansas a slave State. Hence the appeal, in self-defence, to the people of the free States for men, money, and arms; hence the justification for the employment of Sharp's rifles against the "border ruffians." It is said to be a struggle for liberty; and earnest appeals are made to the hearts and the pockets of all who desire to see liberty victorious.

We burn with indignation at the insults and outrages to which the settlers have thus been subjected, and acknowledge their position to be a most perilous and trying one. But we deny, in the first place, that they are acting upon principle, or contending for equal rights. They resent, as a foul slander, the charge of being Abolitionists; they proclaim a truce on their part with slavery where it now exists; they are pro-slavery in spirit and position, in regard to the millions who are grinding in the Southern house of bondage; they have meanly and wickedly proscribed every free man of colour, and made it illegal for him to be a resident in the Territory; they do not object to slave-hunting on their soil, but recognise it as a constitutional obligation which they have no disposition to annul; they go for *all* the pro-slavery compromises of the American Constitution; they are contending for their own rights *as white men,* not for the rights of all, without distinction of caste or colour; they have pursued a shuffling and compromising policy throughout; they have consented to make the existence of liberty or slavery in the Territory dependant upon the will of the majority, fairly expressed, and *to abide by the result.* The retribution now meted out to them is divinely ordered: having sown the wind, they are reaping the whirlwind. It is for them to say one to another, as did the treacherous brethren of Joseph, "We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul, when he besought us, and we would not hear; therefore is this distress come upon us." And while they are yet standing, in common with the great body of the American people, with their feet upon the necks of four millions of chattel slaves—and while, to propitiate the pro-slavery spirit, they have banished from their presence all free coloured emigrants, at the very time they are complaining of having their own rights wrested from them—with what face can they ask for the sympathy and coöperation of those who are battling for the cause of freedom on a world-wide basis? "Let the dead bury their dead."

Again—if such men are deserving of generous sympathy, and ought to be supplied with arms, are not the crushed and bleeding slaves at the South a million times more deserving of pity and succour? Why not, first of all, take measures to furnish them with Sharp's rifles? Their wrongs are beyond description; in comparison with which, those of the people of Kansas are utterly insignificant. Why strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel? If every "border ruffian," invading Kansas, deserves to be shot, much more does every slaveholder, by the same rule; for the former is guilty only of attempting political subjection to his will, while the latter is the destroyer of all human rights, and there is none to deliver. Who will go for arming our slave population? Will Prof. Silliman, or Rev. Mr. Dutton, or Henry Ward Beecher, or Mr. *Killam?* Talk not of difficulties! "Where there's a will, there's a way." And, surely, the most cruelly oppressed are the first who ought to be delivered. Nor can it be denied that, if bloody resistance to tyrants be obedience to God, then the slaves have a right to exterminate every slaveholder as readily as they would destroy a rattlesnake. Let the principle be carried out impartially, or else abandoned for a better one.

It is inexplicable to us to what use all these Sharp's rifles are to be put. "Border ruffianism" has done its work effectually; and now that the perjured tool of the Slave Power, who occupies the Presidential chair, has, by proclamation, avowed his determination to enforce the horrible enactments of the Missouri invaders, what more have they to do? The Free State men, we opine, do not mean to resist the United States Government by force and arms, but to submit (as they will have to submit) in the last resort, however reluctantly. Against what, or whom, are they to point their rifles? We ask for information.

We beg leave to suggest, very kindly and respectfully, to our friend, Mr. Beecher, that, while he is giving the right hand of Christian fellowship to such men as Rev. Nehemiah Adams and President Lord, in spite of their damnable doctrines on the subject of slavery—and while he is recognising as Christian brethren, of a true evangelical stamp, those who strip the slave of his manhood, and count him as so much property—he cannot, with any propriety, continue to call for Sharp's rifles for the defence of Kansas; for "border ruffianism" is the legitimate product of the accursed slave system, with which the American Church is at peace to this day. Let the axe be laid unto the root of the tree. We know he will not take our suggestion unkindly; for he truly says that "the times require plain speaking: it is time for straightforward thinking, for frank speaking, for honest hearts and brave hands."

For our own part, we deeply compassionate the miserable and degraded tools of the slave propagandists, who know not what they do, and (as Mr. Beecher correctly says) are "raked together from the purlieus of a frontier State, drugged with whiskey, and hounded on by broken-down and desperate politicians." But they are far less blameworthy than their employers and endorsers. To a great extent, they are the victims of a horribly false state of society in Missouri, and, no doubt, fearfully depraved; yet they are not beasts, nor to be treated as beasts. Convince us that it is right to shoot anybody, and our perplexity would be to know where to begin—whom first to despatch, as opportunity might offer. We should have to make clean work of the President and his Cabinet—Douglas, Atchison, Stringfellow, Toombs, Wise and their associates—Doctors Lord, Adams, Spring, Fuller and others of the same cloth—Judges Loring, Kane, Grier and Slave Commissioners generally—the conductors of such papers as the New York *Journal of Commerce, Observer, Express, Herald,* and the Satanic press universally. These are the intelligent, responsible and colossal conspirators against the liberty, peace, happiness and safety of the Republic, whose guilt cannot easily be exaggerated. Against their treasonable course our moral indignation burns like fire, though we wish them no harm; only we are sure that they are utterly without excuse.

A VOICE FROM OVER THE SEA.

From The Independent.

OUR missionary brethren in the Micronesian islands have lifted up their voice against the wickedness of American slavery. From their far-off heathen home they look back upon their beloved country and there behold a crime greater than any that pollutes the islands of the tropics. It is no wonder that missionaries have such feelings. They are removed from the political, commercial and social influences that uphold slavery in their native land; their mission is to do away with evil; and they are accustomed to measure everything by the pure standard of the Word of God. A missionary in the East once said, "I have not yet dared to let our converts know that slavery exists in the United States. How can I explain the fact to them so as not to destroy all confidence in our Christianity?" We are glad that our missionaries are lifting up their voices against this stupendous disgrace upon our Christian name, and we trust that their earnest words will be pondered.

EXPRESSION OF MISSIONARIES OF THE A. B. C. F. M. ON AMERICAN SLAVERY.

Whereas, we believe that American slavery is among the potent hindrances to the prevalence of the missionary spirit in the American Church and thus to the speedy conversion of the world, the event dearest to our hearts; and,

Whereas, as American missionaries sojourning in foreign lands, our country's shame is, in a measure, necessarily ours, and we are compelled to hang our heads whenever reminded of Americans to whom the Bible is by law forbidden; and,

Whereas, some endeavour to give the impression that those connected with the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, if not favourable to the institution, are, at least, indifferent to active efforts for its removal; and,

Whereas, we regard it as merely the exercise of an indisputable right, and that there may remain no excuse for misrepresentation or misunderstanding:

Therefore, we, missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, disclaiming any desire to dictate to others, or to mark out for them the path of duty, but thus compelled to feel a painful interest in this subject, take occasion in this manner to express our views and feelings, that we may, at least, exonerate ourselves from the suspicion either of favouring the institution or of want of sympathy with those who prayerfully labour for its extinction.

In the exercise of this right, and under such a conviction of duty, we earnestly utter our deep abhorrence of American slavery as a sin, the enormity of which cannot be expressed in human language, but which must bear some proportion to the unutterable injuries which it inflicts—to the light of the benevolent age which it offends—to the conscientious abhorrence of the civilized world which it disregards—to the high claims of the Holy Scriptures which it violates, and to the equity of Heaven which it defies.

We speak thus of the legalized enormity, American slavery, while at the same time we heartily sympathize with those holding slaves involuntarily and who are anxious alike for their own and their slaves' emancipation.

We are not unmindful of the great difficulties which beset the removal of this gigantic evil, and we pledge to those involved in it, who are endeavouring to extricate themselves therefrom, our heartfelt sympathies and our fervent prayers.

Still, we cannot regard the magnitude of the difficulties which encompass the system as any valid excuse for its support or indefinite continuance; and it is with grief that we see a disposition manifested in some quarters, where we would have expected other things, to extenuate the evils and criminality of slavery; for we cannot but believe it the duty of every American, and especially of every American Christian, to do all that God gives him opportunity to do for the speedy removal of this sin, the stigma of which so weakens the moral power of his country upon the civilized and heathen world.

Hence, at a time like this, when, appalled by these confessed difficulties, good men waver, and bad men, by *their* hesitation, strengthen themselves, we feel that justice to ourselves and faithfulness to our position call upon us to strengthen the hearts of those who labour for the oppressed, by this frank avowal of our sentiments.

ALBERT A. STURGES.
(Signed) E. T. DOANE.
L. H. GULICK.

Ascension Island, April, 1855.

"HUMANITY" VS. CANT.

WE have no desire to get into a personal controversy with *The Observer* over our respective philosophies, though the editors seem fast giving the discussion that character. Two articles have already appeared in their paper on the subject of this deed of the slave-mother in Cincinnati, and not a hint has been uttered of the great point in question; namely, "*What does it show of American slavery?*" From all that appears in their columns, we might suppose this fearful act to have been committed five thousand miles away in the deserts of Africa, and to be only interesting to the American public as a purely abstract question, of how far a generous instinct leading to an unreasonable action may or may not be justifiable. We shall not let you escape so, gentlemen! This may do for your Southern subscribers, but before the readers of *The Independent* we summon you to reply distinctly to the question, "What do such acts show of your much-lauded patriarchal system?" You who have excused and palliated this domestic institution of shame; who have pictured its sufferings light and its pleasures many; who have patched its deformities with leaves from the Bible, and have blessed it, as a means of converting mercy to benighted Africans; you who, in the stormy days of 1850, sought to carry this system over our free soil, and, by an accursed law, to make us slavecatchers—what can you say now to such deeds as this? Here is one of the daughters of this blessed institution—an otherwise mild and amiable woman—stabbing the beloved offspring of her womb, seeking to kill her own children, and, finally, plunging into the waves of the Mississippi, rather than enjoy "the kind and converting influences" of this new means of grace and Christianity! And in the courts of Cincinnati, an American lawyer is seen striving to prove his own client guilty of murder that she may escape the legitimate operation of a law which you defended and helped to pass! When the question was at issue six years ago, when the current could have been turned, which has since flooded the country with border ruffianism and the successful inroads of slavery, you never uttered a generous word for freedom! How could you be expected to speak now, when we are seeing and eating the bitter fruit whose seed you aided to plant? Such acts as this of the slave-mother, and such iniquities as have been practised against free white men on the soil of Kansas, are the legitimate results, on different sides of that system of despotism and injustice, of which your columns, for twenty years, have been the chosen and sanctimonious defenders!

You sneer at the new respect for human "instincts" which is arising, and lament the loss of piety and of the supremacy of the Bible. You dread what is called "humanity."

There are two kinds of piety in the world. One is the noblest thing God has created. It is pure, honest, generous, heroic, loving all of human kind however insignificant or degraded, standing by the weak rather than the strong, looking beyond present custom and authority to what alone is true and just, and kindling forever with the fire of love to the only Noble and All-Perfect One. It is its characteristic in all ages that it is on the side of weakness against power; with the people, the poor and the enslaved rather than with the rich and the strong. It does not seek conformity to custom, or religious phrase, or outward exhibition of devotion, as the main objects; it demands, in public and in private, as the only essentials—Truth, Justice, Nobleness and Love. Such, we believe, alone was Christ's piety; such, imperfectly, has been that of his true followers.

There is another kind of piety, which may be called *Cant.* It is the religion which, in all times and countries, has been on the side of Authority and Power; which has substituted observance and ceremonial for the only real things, justice and love; which has forgotten the slave or the poor, while it has made its phlactery broad and its words odorous of sanctity; which has prostituted the Bible to the defence of oppression and wrong, and made the sacred name of Religion a cover for evils which the uneducated "instincts" of the world scouted at and rejected. Such "piety," the world over, is the support of tyranny and slavery; it has most on its tongue the phrases of religion; it dreads most of all the *instincts* of men—those feelings, by God implanted, which demand justice and generosity as the first essentials in human actions. It fears "Humanity." It rides wrapped in priestly robes in its chariot, and trembles at the great masses below, who hate Priestcraft and who beg for the bread of Truth and Reality. This is the "piety" which scatters infidelity like a sower. In France in the eighteenth century—in Prussia now—in England, it is this State-religion, this religion of power, which makes men—noble men—doubt the existence of the Divine fact of religion. It is so here. Of you, personally, gentlemen, we know nothing; but your paper, in some of its positions, especially on the great question of Freedom and oppression, has been the very organ of such "piety," or such cant.

We believe such journals as yours, in their articles on the slavery question, make the masses doubt whether there be such a thing as a noble religion.

The young man entering on life, unregenerate, says, "Here is a religious journal, a paper using the language of piety, defending American slavery! My own *instincts*—the feelings of my corrupt heart—my unconverted intuitions utterly abhor and reject such a position. Sinful as I am, I would not accept the salvation which is conditioned on such a base compliance! I would rather have my 'instincts' than the *Observer's* piety!" And he is an unbeliever.

It is your journal—such opinions as your columns maintain on the reform questions of the day—which scatter broadcast such unbelief. You sneer at "socialistic" humanity, but you should know that such a course as yours will make men prefer even this philosophy to your cant.

We do not fear the result. Piety will reclaim its own; and, while in unison with, will prove itself above the instincts; and each day, on the question of freedom, the nation will more and more reject such teachers as this *religious* journal.—*C. L. Brace, in The Independent.*

SPEECH OF LUCY STONE BLACKWELL.

[We find the following report of a speech, recently made by LUCY STONE BLACKWELL, at an Anti-Slavery Banquet in Cincinnati, in the *Weekly Freeman* of that city.]

MRS. L. S. BLACKWELL said, when God spanned the river with a great free bridge, but a little while ago, thousands of slaves had travelled over this highway. She had been at the stations of the U. G. R. R., up and down the river, and had heard of parties—one, two, five, ten, and even twenty in a party—moving northward. And, with heart full of gratitude for this, she came to-night to speak a word that she hoped might enable us to look the grim monster of Slavery in the face, and lead us to see how wrong it was that there should be any over whose escape we were to rejoice. She held in her hand a paper where pots and kettles, and traces and carts, and oxen and horses, men and women, all mingled in one advertisement, were announced to be sold on New Year's day; and one of these chattels, a girl of 14, brought $1,245! The South was all one den of infamy. No woman was safe there, if her skin were dark, from the brutal violence of any libertine. How had her heart sunk within her as she had seen in this city the force of the United States applied to carry back into slavery a woman who had escaped. If, by some horrible sorcery, a woman with golden hair and blue eyes, like Mr. Headington, had been lured into a den of infamy, and kept there for years, and were at length to break away from that den and run for safety, and men were to follow her, and, as she, shrieking, ran, block up every street but the way to the jail—and if she were to cut the throat of the children who had grown up beside her, rather than have them go back to that den she had left, and then these same men were to go through a legal farce, and at last send her back to her prison of shame, would decent men speak to those who did this? And yet, Judge Leavitt, and Commissioner Pendery, and Marshals Robinson, Bennett and Brown, and their posse, and lawyers Finnell, Wall and Chambers, and Headington, had done this.

Oh, it pained her to see a young man, and a man of ability like Mr. Headington, taking the rich offering of his youthful talent and laying it on the shrine of slavery.

She could think of no sorrow so deep as must be his mother's, to know she bore such a son. She could but think how his sister could have no greater disgrace than to be known as his sister; and if he had a wife, by her wifehood she felt how deep must be the pain of her who bore his name.

It is our duty to create a public sentiment that shall make it so disgraceful to engage in slave-catching that no man will do it. When freedom and human rights are endangered, there is no time to count the cost of property. Mrs. B. read an extract from the *Gazette,* during the slave-trial, and commented upon it severely, as an instance of the slavery toadyism so common at the North. The mothers of the Revolution gave their linen for cartridges and armed their sons for war. If we are the daughters of such women, let us show it by our deeds and devotion to the anti-stavery cause.

SLAVERY, USURPATION, DESPOTISM.

THERE is a lesson in the debates in Congress on the electioneering frauds and Border Ruffianism in Kansas that ought to be pondered. A large party of Representatives have been seen affirming the sacredness of a fraudful usurpation, and ready to brand as treasonable any opposition against it, and to crush any attempt to investigate it. A despotic usurper like Louis Napoleon would rejoice with such a Court of Senators and Representatives to affirm the divine right of his crime. Doctrines that will support despotism answer just as well for slavery, and men that will support slavery would, under appropriate circumstances, be found just as strong and remorseless in support of despotism.

There is the same lesson in the doings of a similar party determined to defend a similar fraud, in the case of Barstow's assumed election as Governor of Wisconsin. Compare these cases and their result with the successful fraud of Napoleon. Why do Barstow, and Whitfield, and the Border Ruffians fail in this game, while on the other side of the water the imperial despot is successful? Given, in France, a fraudful election, a tyrant determined to profit by it, and a Parliament to sanctify the wrong and repress inquiry; and the conspiracy and the fraudful votes, and the semblance of a legal Parliament, shall inure to the success of the usurper. But in much the same circumstances, given, in America, a fraudful election, a pro-slavery candidate to hold by it, and a Legislature to confirm and sanction the wrong; and with all this, the game is unsuccessful; there is a higher power, a Court of Justice, free and independent, where investigation cannot be stifled; and the fraudfully elected tool of a party and of slavery has to submit to the judgment of the court, for the people will sustain *that,* and not the mandate of the usurper.

Now, why is this? Whence this mighty difference? Why cannot the usurpation practised so successfully in France be as successfully practised in America, and on the same declarative grounds of formal law, and supreme respect, unquestioning, for official and legal authority? Especially when in America, as in France, there is a party willing and eager to defend the fraud, and resist the scrutiny, and confirm the depotism, and make it treasonable to deny its legality? Some would answer, because the people are accustomed to self-government. Others, because of an independent Supreme Court. But not so. Neither wisdom nor self-government in the people, nor an independent judiciary, would prevent their being sacrificed, prevent the success of such a fraudful *coup d'état* for slavery and despotism, were it not for one thing *the want of a standing army at command.* Only for one reason is the game unsuccessful here, *executive guards and bayonets wanting.* Give that requisite, in addition to a party determined on a despotism and capable of fraud, or resolved on slavery and ready to back up a fraudful election, and you give the power of usurpation, and nothing can prevent it. It is just as certain that Barstow would have held his fraudfully obtained authority if he had had a standing army devoted to him at his disposal, as it is that for want of such support he has

had a heap rather be free than slaves. And who, that does not wish to stultify and deceive himself and others, knowing human nature, would assert the opposite?

Surely, those who have been so long toiling for the rights of humanity never had so much to encourage them to continue their efforts as they now have. A few more closely and firmly contested battles, and that prestige of victory which, in this country, has so long been on the side of slavery will have passed away forever. *

*WHITTIER'S "PANORAMA."—*Extracts.

THE DOUGHFACES.

Such are the men who, with instinctive dread,
Whenever Freedom lifts her drooping head,
Make prophet-tripods of their office-stools,
And scare the nurseries and the village schools
With dire presage of ruin grim and great,
A broken Union and a foundered State!
Such are the patriots, self-bound to the stake
Of office, martyrs for their country's sake,
Who fill themselves the hungry jaws of Fate
And by their loss of manhood save the State!
In the wide gulf themselves like Curtius throw,
And test the virtues of cohesive dough;
As tropic monkeys, linking heads and tails,
Bridge o'er some torrent of Ecuador's vales.
Such are the men who in your chambers rave
To swearing point, at mention of the slave,
When some poor parson, haply unawares,
Stammers of freedom in his timid prayers;
Who, if some foot-sore negro through the town
Steals northward, volunteer to hunt him down,
Or, if some neighbour, flying from disease,
Courts the mild balsam of the Southern breeze,
With hue and cry pursue him on his track,
And write *Free-Soiler* on the poor man's back.
Such are the men who leave the pedlar's cart,
While passing South, to learn the driver's art,
Or, in white neckcloth, soothe with pious aim
The graceful sorrows of some languid dame,
Who, from the wreck of her bereavement, saves
The double charm of widowhood and slaves!
Pliant and apt, they lose no chance to show
To what base depths apostacy can go;
Outdo the natives in their readiness
To roast a negro, or to mob a press;
Poise a tarred schoolmate on the lyncher's rail,
Or make a bonfire of their birth-place mail!

So some poor wretch, whose lips no longer bear
The sacred burden of his mother's prayer,
By fear impelled, or lust of gold enticed,
Turns to the Crescent from the Cross of Christ,
And, over-acting in superfluous zeal,
Crawls prostrate where the faithful only kneel,
Out-howls the Dervish, hugs his rags to court
The squalid Santon's sanctity of dirt;
And, when beneath the city gateway's span
Files slow and long the Meccan caravan,
And through its midst, pursued by Islam's prayers,
The prophet's Word some favoured camel bears,
The marked apostate has his place assigned,
The Koran-bearer's sacred rump behind,
With brush and pitcher following, grave and mute,
In meek attendance on the holy brute.

A PICTURE.

"Look," said the Showman, sternly, as he rolled
His curtain upward; "Fate's reverse behold!"

A village straggling in loose disarray
Of vulgar newness, premature decay;
A tavern, crazy with its whiskey brawls,
With "*Slaves at Auction!*" garnishing its walls.
Without, surrounded by a motley crowd,
The shrewed-eyed salesman, garrulous and loud,
A squire or colonel in his pride of place,
Known at free fights, the caucus, and the race,
Prompt to proclaim his honour without blot,
And silence doubters with a ten-pace shot,
Mingling the negro-driving bully's rant
With pious phrase and democratic cant,
Yet never scrupling, with a filthy jest,
To sell the infant from its mother's breast,
Break through all ties of wedlock, home, and kin,
Yield shrinking girlhood up to gray-beard sin;
Sell all the virtues with his human stock,
The Christian graces on his auction-block,
And coolly count on shrewdest bargains driven
In hearts regenerate, and in souls forgiven!

Look once again! The moving canvass shows
A slave plantation's slovenly repose,
Where, in rude cabins rotting midst their weeds,
The human chattel eats, and sleeps, and breeds;
And, held a brute, in practice, as in law,
Becomes in fact the thing he's taken for.
There, early summoned to the hemp and corn,
The nursing mother leaves her child new-born;
There haggard sickness, weak and deathly faint,
Crawls to his task, and fears to make complaint;
And sad-eyed Rachels, childless in decay,
Weep for their lost ones sold and torn away!
Of ampler size the master's dwelling stands,
In shabby keeping with his half-tilled lands—
The gates unhinged, the yard with weeds unclean,
The cracked veranda with a tipsy lean.
Without, loose scattered like a wreck adrift,
Signs of misrule and tokens of unthrift;
Within, profusion to discomfort joined,
The listless body and the vacant mind;
The fear, the hate, the theft and falsehood, born
In menial hearts of toil, and stripes, and scorn!
There, all the vices, which, like birds obscene,
Batten on slavery loathsome and unclean,
From the foul kitchen to the parlour rise,
Pollute the nursery where the child-heir lies,
Taint infant lips beyond all after cure,
With the fell poison of a breast impure;
Touch boyhood's passions with the breath of flame,
From girlhood's instincts steal the blush of shame.
So swells from low to high, from weak to strong,
The tragic chorus of the baleful wrong;
Guilty or guiltless, all within its range
Feel the blind justice of its sure revenge.

Still scenes like these the moving heart reveals.
Up the long western steppes the blighting steals;
Down the Pacific slope the evil Fate
Glides like a shadow to the Golden Gate:
From sea to sea the drear eclipse is thrown,
From sea to sea the *Mauvaises Terres* have grown,
A belt of curses on the New World's zone!

The curtain fell. All drew a freer breath,
As men are wont to do when mournful death
Is covered from their sight. The Showman stood
With drooping brow in sorrow's attitude
One moment, then with sudden gesture shook
His loose hair back, and, with the air and look
Of one who felt, beyond the narrow stage
And listening group, the presence of the age,
And heard the footsteps of the things to be,
Poured out his soul in earnest words and free.

"O, friends!" he said, "in this poor trick of paint
You see the semblance, incomplete and faint,
Of the two-fronted Future, which, to-day,
Stands dim and silent, waiting in your way.
To-day, your servant, subject to your will;
To-morrow, master, or for good or ill.
If the dark face of slavery on you turns,
If the mad curse its paper barrier spurns,
If the world granary of the West is made
The last foul market of the slaver's trade,
Why rail at fate? the mischief is your own.
Why hate your neighbour? Blame yourselves alone!"

COMMERCE IN COOLIES.

Visitors to Cuba, during the past Winter, have had enlarged opportunities of noting the condition of the Cooly apprentices, of whom thousands swarm everywhere on that lovely island. On the plantation they have seen them driven to the field or the mill, like cattle, retained at work with the lash, and whipped cruelly for idleness or insubordination. In all particulars, they will have noted their agrestic life suffers in comparison with that of the African who toils at his side, for he is spared, because owned, by his master, while Cooly servitude is restricted to a certain term of years; and every interest of the sugar and tobacco cultivator lies in extracting the largest amount of service within that term. Those reserved for domestic offices fare better. Yet, in the cities, the comparison between the African and Asiatic is always favourable to the former. The Cooly, though of much greater intelligence, tact and industry, is more frequently whipped, more constantly overworked, more unsparingly abused. They are bought and sold precisely as the African. When, by excessive cruelty, they are driven to despair, their refuge is suicide, opium supplying the means, and the expectation of immediate translation after death to the Celestial Empire, whence they came, the inducement. The number of suicides is represented as frightful. This scheme of slavery, every feature of which is worse in all particulars than negro servitude, sickens the traveller in Cuba at every turn. Every domestic duty, including those ordinarily assigned to women, he finds executed in the house where he lodges by these oriental slaves. Slaves, nominally, for seven years; but, substantially, for life, since no provision is made for restoring them to their homes, and, while in Cuba, their portion is the inevitable yoke.

A vessel laden with these wretched creatures was cast away near Havana on the 28th ult. It was, we regret to say, a vessel owned in New York, and well known in the mercantile marine for its speed, though certainly no evidence of that quality was afforded by its last and fatal voyage from Amoy to Cuba, four months being the time. It left the former port with a crowded freight, decoyed on board, doubtless, by those atrocious and reckless representations which correspondents from that part of the world repeat to us as the staple of imposition upon an ignorant and guileless people. Of the five hundred and eighty embarked, eighty had perished before the voyage ended. What home-sickness, discomfort, privations and despair—what close crowding in pestiferous holds and cabins, while twice crossing the Equator—must have fed this awful ratio of death to life, we can readily imagine, with the aid of data furnished in other instances. Unlike the Guinea voyage, the path is long, reaching more than half around the globe. The food is proportioned, not to the wants of the captives, but to a nice estimate of the lowest amount upon which human life can exist, slightly reduced in favour of the profit and loss account of the owner. No occupant of a State prison subsists upon such lenten fare. Water is doled out with equal parsimony. Discipline is of the sternest. Of course, discontent with such starvation-diet, and with the first awakening to the fact that the journey is not of a day or two, but of months, and that, instead of being free men and passengers, they are of less consideration than so many quadrupeds, is anticipated and provided against. The crew being comparatively few, the odds are made up by arming them to the teeth. A few examples are always made the first week out; what is the sacrifice of a half-dozen Asiatics, in the scale with the safety of the captain and crew? The cruelty systematically practised upon the poor creatures, in order to frighten them into abject submission and silence, is described, by occasional passengers in such vessels, as absolutely demoniacal and heart-rending. Thus, beaten, knocked down, kicked, cuffed, stabbed, thrown overboard or shot, if more than usually troublesome; pent up in quarters filthy and thronged to that degree that those who survive the fevers thus engendered are enfeebled and wasted to the last tenuity; with no more clothing or means of warmth when doubling the bleak Capes at the South than when passing under the burning line; is it any wonder that the loss of but 80 out of 580 should be named as creditable to the officers of the vessel? More frequently 20 per cent. are sacrificed on the voyage. Nay, in one instance, the captain found it due to his safety to smother the whole cargo, over 500, beneath the hatches, notwithstanding it involved subsequently the labour of throwing the dead bodies overboard—a task of considerable magnitude.

And this barbarous commerce, begun in the practice of deception and falsehood upon the ignorant and needy, continued in a spirit of inhumanity at which human nature recoils with horror, and ended in dooming its victims to irretrievable slavery, employs whole fleets of ships, and sweeps every ocean. Thousands are carried to perish on the guano islands of the Pacific, and in the mines of Peru and Bolivia. Thousands are carried to the British Colonies adjacent to Demerara, and to the British Islands in the West India Archipelago. Thousands are carried to Cuba and Porto Rico. They swarm in California—there, happily, not in a condition of involuntary servitude. And the most painful fact of all is, that American merchants, doubtless through ignorance of the traffic, send their shipping to assist in a business not a bit more humane or respectable than negro slave-trading, and which has not already, like that, been condemned as piracy by the common voice and law of nations, merely because the evidence of its enormous character has not been fairly spread before the world. That such current publicity may be soon attained should be the desire of every philanthropist. Once instructed as to the nature of the Cooly commerce, the common sense of mankind must be so loud in its reprobation that no law would be needed to deter a humane merchant from sharing in it; its attendant infamy would be prohibition enough. Until that condition of public sentiment shall have been excited, the task that Clarkson and Wilberforce believed themselves to have finished will be still incomplete.

By referring to our telegraphic reports from Washington it will be seen that this matter has at last arrested the attention of Congress, and is to be made the subject of a special investigation; the committee on Foreign Affairs having been instructed to inquire into the expediency of declaring the Cooly trade to be, like the African slave trade, illegal; and, on the motion of Mr. Pringle, the President was requested to furnish all the information he may have touching the traffic in Coolies by American merchants, and also in relation to the loss of the Sea Witch on the coast of Cuba, to which we have alluded in this article.—*Times.*

FROM KANSAS.

Correspondence of The Boston Traveller.

Lawrence, K. T., Thursday, March 20, 1856.

As a change of subject may be agreeable, allow me to say a few words upon *peace* affairs, which aspect of things is now most prominent. I have just returned from attendance at the sitting of the first State Assembly. You may form some idea of the enthusiasm of the people in this movement from the fact that a complete organization was effected on the first day. Many of the members came more than one hundred miles on foot, crossing streams on floating cakes of ice, and over roads almost impassable. More than a full quorum were present at the opening of the session, and every member but *one* readily and boldly took the solemn oath "*to support the Constitution of the United States and of the State of Kansas.*" No flinching, and there will be none in the work of demanding and maintaining their rights.

We have heard of "times that tried men's souls," and I have been permitted to witness the bearing of true men in such a crisis. It was known that Gov. Shannon was in the neighbourhood, and it was believed that he was clothed with power to arrest the officers and members for high treason. Place yourself in such a position, in a remote corner of the country, with the whole influence and power of the Federal Executive arrayed against your rights, and you can form some feeble estimate of the degree of moral courage required to stand up boldly and assert and demand your rights. During the fortnight they were in session I visited them twice, and spent several days in watching their proceedings and in making acquaintance with the members. In the whole Assembly of both Houses, I am told but one member ever sat in a legislative Assembly before; yet, for intelligence and character, they would compare well even with your Massachusetts House of Representatives. The short session was spent in arranging preliminaries and in passing such laws as were necessary to complete the first organization of a Government.

But to set themselves right before the country and to close the mouths of their adversaries, they passed at the outset a joint resolution, suspending the operation of all laws until such time as they were admitted into the Union, unless by special act. So confident are we of the justness of our cause and of the expediency of an immediate State organization that we cannot believe that our plea will be rejected when the facts are truly known.

Messrs. Reeder and Lane were elected United States Senators, and able memorials adopted to the President and the two Houses of Congress, setting forth fully and truly our grievances and necessities. If these, with the Governor's Message, produce no effect, and we are to be ruthlessly deprived of our rights and subjected to all the horrors of civil war, for presuming to enact laws for our own protection, when we are without law or protection, the responsibility rests not upon us. But we expect no such thing. Our neighbours of Missouri will hardly be likely to interfere with us, if we are well armed and prepared for self-defence, and the country will demand, in tones not to be misunderstood or disregarded by their servants at Washington, that we shall be at once admitted to the brotherhood of States.

As I watched the proceedings from stage to stage, I became impressed with the feeling that it was no boys' play, but that men of stout hearts and strong wills were at work in earnest, and that, in Western phrase, there would be no "backing down."

At the close of the session, a Committee of twenty was appointed to draft a code of laws, with instructions to sit during the recess. There seems to be a strong determination to prepare codes of laws that shall be worthy the State, such as will make Kansas the pride of the Union. Codes, digests and reports are solicited from which to select. We shall have an eclectic code, discarding the old and useless, and adopting with modification such as will be adapted to our rising greatness. With a good code of laws, and liberal provision for, and wise arrangements of, our School system, we are destined to become, through the bountiful provision of Providence, an envied State. Let politicians, and demagogues, and pro-slavery nullifiers say what they will, there can be no question of the fact that the State movement is a spontaneous movement of the people and the whole people.

If Congress should be so foolish as to order a new movemement for the formation of a Constitution, the people, unless invaded, would unanimously vote to take the one already formed, officers and all. So, what would be gained is but an opportunity for invasion and bloodshed. Sure as there lives a God in heaven, any further attempts at interference will be followed by the most awful consequences. Our people are strong and their patience is exhausted. The ruffians are at the length of their chain, and another step will involve them in ruin most signal. They will be swept from the face of the earth as with the besom of destruction.

I see a short paragraph in your paper of March 3 stating that the Kickapoo Rangers were making preparations to drive out the Free State settlers, and that the United States forces had been ordered to rendezvous at Fort Scott. Now, permit me to remind you that said despatch originated in Missouri. The Kickapoo Rangers will soon find more profitable business at their accustomed employment—that of blackleg gamblers on board the river boats. Their commander is the most notorious blackleg to be found on the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. During the close of navigation they were employed to harrass the settlers. As to the United States forces, the facts are, that one company of dragoons have been for the last four weeks stationed upon the Miami lands, in the south part of the State, to protect those lands from encroachments. Yesterday they passed through this place en route for Fort Leavenworth. The hue and cry, as it comes from Missouri, has a purpose, and, I suppose, a portion of their threats toward us may be referred to the same end. Yet, not knowing what may occur, it is safe for us to take them at their word, and be prepared for the worst. They intend, no doubt, to do all they can to frighten away free emigration, by representing, in dark colours, the dangers to which they expose themselves by coming here. Slaveholders of Missouri acknowledge that, in a fair emigration, they stand no chance. The slaveholding emigrant must build two houses; the free man one. By squatter title only one hundred and sixty acres can be held, which is no plantation. Add to this the uncertainty of slave property in the prospect, and you can well understand why slaveholders are shy of coming here. But what would they do? I had it from the lips of one of the leaders, who spoke without knowing in whose presence he said it, that *the slaveholding policy was, by noise and bluster, threats and violence, to deter emigration from the free States, and thus preserve the land open to settlement until the public sale was ordered, and then they (the slaveholders) could come in and purchase as large farms as they wanted.*

Let the emigrants of the free States note this and act accordingly. If our route could be made through Iowa, so as to avoid the disagreeable necessity of passing through Missouri, it would increase the emigration. This is beginning to be the case to some extent; and the disposition to trade at St. Louis is growing less and less. Since the recent robbery of Mr. Hoyt, by the leading men of Lexington, on his way up the river, the determination to quit St. Louis at the earliest possible moment has been fixed. Certainly it will be the case unless her merchants, who have influence over the boats, promptly interfere to restore Mr. Hoyt his property and to prevent further outrages. They have the power in this case in their own hands, and, if they refuse to exercise it, they should be held strictly accountable.

I know of no way to close this somewhat extended and still more rambling epistle than by an anecdote to show the spirit of our men, or rather *women*, in the Free State cause. At Topeka I became acquainted with an old gentleman, a member from Sugar Creek, near Arkansas. He was born in Kentucky, and had lived, except one year, there and in Arkansas. That year he spent in the south part of Illinois, where he removed to get away from slavery; but, finding so much hypocrisy there among men who, though living in a free State, still owned slaves and hired them out in Missouri, he returned in disgust to Arkansas. On the opening of this Territory, he removed here to aid, as he said, in making a free State of the right sort. He arrived at the capital on the second day of the session at the time the members were expecting an arrest. Some of his party hesitated about taking the prescribed oath, but, by the persuasions of the old man, they were induced to do so. In speaking of it afterward to me, he said, "If I had gone home without taking the oath, would n't my wife have given me scissors. She would have called me coward, and that is what she never yet did." Such are the men and women who have moved here from *slave States*, and do you think Freedom can be *crushed out?* Sooner will the heavens fall and the Union be shattered into fragments. Yours truly, W.

National Anti-Slavery Standard

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1856.

TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY!

The Twenty-Third Public Anniversay of the American Anti-Slavery Society will be held at the CITY ASSEMBLY ROOMS (No. 446 Broadway, between Howard and Grand sts.), in the City of New York, on WEDNESDAY, May 7th, at 10 o'clock A. M., and will be continued at the same place during the remainder of the day, and on Thursday, 8th. Addresses are expected from Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Rev. Theodore Parker, Mrs. Lucy Stone Blackwell, of Cincinnati, Rev. Samuel J. May, of Syracuse, Charles L. Remond, and others to be hereafter announced.

As full an attendance of the members and friends of the Society as practicable, from all parts of the country, is earnestly desired and strongly urged.

We reiterate our former declaration, that the object of the Society is not *merely* to make "Liberty national and Slavery sectional"—nor to prevent the acquisition of Cuba—nor to restore the Missouri Compromise—nor to repeal the Fugitive Slave bill—nor to make Kansas a free State—nor to resist the admission of any new slave State into the Union—nor to terminate slavery in the District of Columbia and in the National Territories—but it is, primarily, comprehensively, and uncompromisingly, to effect the immediate, total and eternal overthrow of Slavery, wherever it exists on American soil, and to expose and confront whatever party or sect seeks to purchase peace or success at the expense of human liberty. Living or dying, our motto is "No Union with Slaveholders, religiously or politically!"

In behalf of the Executive Committee,
WM. LLOYD GARRISON, President.

Edmund Quincy, S. H. Gay, } Secretaries.

☞ Rhode Island Anti-Slavery Convention.—A Convention of all persons in the State of Rhode Island opposed to Slavery and in favour of its Immediate and Unconditional Abolition—and to that end the friends of a thorough and persistent Agitation against its multiform cruelties, incessant encroachments, and daring usurpations—will be held in Westminster Hall (Westminster st.), in the City of PROVIDENCE, commencing on SATURDAY morning, April 26th, at 10 o'clock, A.M., continuing through day and evening, and also through SUNDAY, 27th, day and evening.

Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Stephen S. Foster, Wm. Wells Brown, Samuel May, Jr., and other speakers, will be present.

WE WILL SUBDUE YOU!

These are the Roman words addressed by Mr. Douglas, as the representative of the Slavocracy, to Mr. Sumner, as the embodiment of the political Anti-Slavery of the country, in the Senate, not long ago. It may not have been prudent in the champion of Slavery to put his resolution into so very portable a shape. Epigrams are bad things for politicians, because they stick so easily in men's memories. But we do not think it very material in this case. The whole *prestige* of success in time past is on his side, and the chances of it still holding good for the future are very promising. We think that he *will* subdue the opponents of the admission of Kansas as a Slave State. He may himself be crushed under the wheels of the triumphal chariot of Slavery as it rolls up to the Capitol with Kansas following in chains. There is every probability that he will be. But the great victory over the North will be won, and he can retire to Chicago as Scipio did to Linternum, and complain to the voters of Lake Michigan of the ingratitude of the country he had helped to save. But we think she will be saved. The sacrifice of a virgin State to the monster we serve in this country will be completed, and we shall have an interval of gorged repose until its appetite craves another victim.

The Republican party, which represents the political phase of opposition to the aggressions of Slavery, has at least shown one sign of strategic skill. It has taken the Macedonian phalanx as its model, and has made the point it opposes to the enemy to the very finest possible. Everybody, of all shades of opinion, and clad in the tattered remnants of the uniforms of all possible parties, are welcome to enlist in its ranks; and the plan of the campaign is laid out with a judicious economy of Anti-Slavery expenditures. All manner of men who are indisposed to let Slavery help herself to Kansas are invited to join its banners and make a stand against the hastening armies of the aliens. Men who really hate Slavery, like Wade of Ohio, and men who only hate negroes, like the editor of the *Hartford Courant*, are to stand cheek by jowl and fight shoulder to shoulder in this conflict. We don't know that this is to be complained of. It is the way in which parties must be made up. As Lord Mahon well remarks, "parties are like coin, which would be never fit for common use without some considerable alloy of the baser metals." But we must be pardoned for thinking that there is a more excellent way for the expenditure of Anti-Slavery energies than this. This may be better than nothing; but there is something vastly better than this.

We do not believe that the Republican party can obtain even the moderate object it proposes to itself. Even if it could, what would it amount to? The Constitution of the United States remains the same Palladium of Slavery that it has always been. All the Legislation which has been had under it will still hold good. Slavery will sit *en permanence* in the Senate as it now does. The atoms may change, but the personal identity will remain, and it would be still as impossible as it is now that any substantial measure of Freedom should ever force its way through that impregnable defile. The domestic Slave Trade would still go on. The Fugitive Slave Law would be still in force. Slavery would still rule us with her rod of iron, and the day of the final victory would be as far off as ever. We are glad that the Kansas outrages should have excited even this degree of antagonism to Slavery; that there is this degree of spirit aroused by the immediate sense of the wrongs which Slavery scatters with an impartial hand on the free as well as on the bond. But we are only glad for those to whom this step is an advance. To patients suffering under chronic Whiggery or Democracy it may be a wholesome shock, this blow in the face Slavery has dealt them. It may be the beginning of a genuine convalescence. But it is a terrible step backward for any one who has once stood on the firm heights of Anti-Slavery, and one from which it will be very difficult to recover.

We do not complain of the course of events and of the difficulty and slowness with which the Anti-Slavery Idea struggles into life. For it is the due course of Nature. It cannot approach its end except by faltering footsteps at first. But let us beware how we confound the beginning with the end, and take the uncertain footing of one who sees men as trees walking for the firm tread of him that has received his sight. The Republican party triumphant and seated in the White House, with a clean majority in the House of Representatives, would Slavery be materially weakened? Some of her more gratuitous insults might be repressed, as far as we are concerned; but would the Slave be substantially better off? Would the arm of the master be shortened, the scent of the bloodhound impaired, the gripe of the kidnapping Judges and Commissioners relaxed? The work an Abolitionist proposes to himself is not principally the recovery and defence of his own rights. He recognises in the injury which Slavery has worked to these the just and necessary punishment of his accompliceship in the crime. He will receive his restoration to them as an inhering part of his reward for having tried to make amends for the sins of his days of darkness; and he sees that even for this subordinate and secondary result, so partial a movement as the Republican party is entirely insufficient for the work. He recognises in it a symptom towards recovery, and not the sign of entire restoration to health.

One thing, however, is certain. Mr. Douglas may subdue the Republican party, and very likely will; but he can never subdue the Anti-Slavery feeling, which is the breath of whatever life that party has. Whatever attempts may be made, inherent in the very nature of a political party, to lower the pale of the Church so that the greatest number possible may be induced to slip into it, still it is on an honest hatred of Slavery that it must depend for what earnest service and for what measure of success it can look. This spirit will not die of disappointment or failure. The Slaveholders will not withhold from it abundant food to keep it alive and active. If this mode of expressing itself fails, it will find another. A true soul will never fail of a transmigration. As for those who come into an Anti-Slavery party for what they can get in the scramble of a success, it is of no moment what becomes of them. Men grow into wisdom by mistakes, and we think we can discern that it has made perceptible progress already. This Republican party, far as it is from the ideal of an Anti-Slavery political party, is still, on the whole, an advance on the parties of an Anti-Slavery complexion that went before it. From defeat and disappointment, which must needs be the lot of such men, even if they could succeed in their immediate aim, many of them must go on from strength to strength. Many of them, unquestionably, are ready for much more radical measures, did they but see that the time had come for them.

The business of the Abolitionists is to criticise all halfway covenants, and to point out their inherent weakness, and to show the more excellent way. Politics are of no avail except so far as they express and project a state of mind. When the mind of the American people is made up to be rid of Slavery, it will very soon find the means of doing it. Until it is so resolved, all attempts to check its excesses must be imperfect and disappointing. The business of the Abolitionists is thus to mould the general mind—to impress on it the degree of its guilt in what it does and what it neglects to do in this matter—to show the deserved penalty it brings upon itself—and to point out the only sufficient deliverance. Slavery is not to be abolished—our own complicity is not to be shaken off—by Caucuses and Conventions, or by the substitution of one set of men for another to administer the same Draconic code of laws. Revolution only can cope with the task—a Revolution not necessarily baptized in blood, but one that shall substitute a new form of government for that which makes Slavery its corner-stone. This Revolution must come in time, as surely as a pyramid standing on its apex must sooner or later fall. He is the true patriot who demonstrates this eternal necessity arising from the laws of moral gravitation, and warns the people to be wise in time.

AMOS KENDALL'S BIBLE ARGUMENT.

Philadelphia, April 5th, 1856.

To the Editors of The Anti-Slavery Standard:

We view the Bible, or the Holy Scriptures, as it is sometimes called, as sufficient authority, given by God himself, through his mediums of good, rational and inspired men and women, on which we can spiritually and rationally found his True Church on earth. The books that compose this Bible are plain, perfect and absolutely supreme; and are holy standards of faith and practice, worthy our attention; and we believe that it is our duty and our interest to understand and obey their mandates, so far as we rationally and conscientiously believe them.

By frequently, attentively and religiously reading these Scriptures, by pure and holy meditation thereon, and by *comparing one place with another*, in search of truth, with singleness of heart, attended with devout and fervent prayer for, and confident dependence on, the instructing spirit of God, to explain and apply the Bible Scriptures to our souls, we may attain what knowledge of them is necessary to our salvation, our happiness and comfort both here and hereafter; but we must acknowledge that skill in the original languages in which the Bible was written—knowledge of history and philosophy—perusal of numerous and various commentators and translators, when used in due *subordination* to the Bible itself, are very useful in obtaining for ourselves a further acquaintance with the will, word and mind of God, as they are contained within ourselves and the Bible. Thus believing, we humbly and kindly review and, we hope, truthfully criticise Amos Kendall's erroneous deductions of his "Bible Arguments for Slavery," which appeared in The Standard of March 29, 1856.

Mr. Kendall says, "Abolitionism, under its present aspect, *is the most direct road to infidelity the Devil ever invented.* It must and will, as in many instances it has done already, *throw away the Bible and deny the God of the Bible*"; he also says, "I own no slaves and am not an *advocate* of the institution." We have read these assertions with a full conviction that they are the judgments of a heated imagination, erroneously drawn from his own false notions of the Bible doctrine of servitude; for Amos knows full well the truth of the old adage, "Ille qui servit diabolum durum servit servitutem," *that he who serves the devil serves a hard servitude.* Our friend Amos must either repudiate the idea that "he is not an advocate for slavery," or he must, according to his own showing of the scriptural doctrine, as set forth by himself, repudiate that part of his argument in which he says, "God never once condemned Abraham for buying men with his money"; also, "Every man that believes in the Bible must believe that God, whom he professes to serve, so far from denouncing slavery as a sin, unfitting men for the Church and Heaven, *expressly authorized his chosen people to buy men and women and hold them in bondage forever,*" or he must deny what he calls "the words of God himself," and thus become the first fruit of his own absurd doctrine by "throwing away the Bible and denying the God of the Bible."

We do most ardently hope that brother Kendall will read his Bible with more care, more thought and more literature than he heretofore has read it; we feel confident that the "sincere Christians" of the country whom he speaks of can never make their God of *Love*, their God of *Mercy, Justice, Life* and *Liberty*, a God of *tyranny*, a God of *hatred*, a God of *injustice, death* and *slavery*. Whatever idea Mr. Kendall may have about his own God, we are sure that the rational Christian can never subscribe to believe in a God of such antagonistic principles as those above specified.

He says, "The Northern professors of religion, including multitudes of the clergy, now teach and act on the principle that the owner of slaves is unfit to be a member of their churches; and of course is unfit to associate with them in the heaven to which they aspire." Friend Amos, this is another erroneous conclusion; it does not follow that because *men* may judge others unfit for church communion membership, that God concludes them to be unfit associates for heaven; and I can say, as one of the Northern clergy, and I hope that there are "multitudes" of others that can, as "sincere Christians," deny the truthfulness of the above quotation. If every slaveholder in the land, if every Judas-like traitor in America, and if every thief-like negro-stealer in the world, would but act as the thief who hung upon the cross, at the same time that Jesus was crucified, acted, we could and would acknowledge each as our brother and companion, fit to associate not only with us, but with God himself, either in heaven or on earth.

Mr. Kendall says, "Abraham dealt in flesh and blood; he *bought servants with his money*; your Bible tells you that God talked with this man; that he was a special favourite of the Almighty on account of his religious faith; and throughout your Bible he is represented as one of the best of men, '*the father of the faithful.*'" All this is, when rationally understood, true; yet you, as many other biblical commentators on Bible-Slavery advocacy, fully manifest your total ignorance of the Jewish or Hebrew customs and laws concerning *private property*. Neither the Hebrews nor the Israelites ever held a perpetual interest or right to *any* kind of property, real or personal, as the releasement of *all* property and the restoration thereof was made every Jubilee year, and a partial restoration took place every *seventh* year, or what was termed, by their law, a Sabbatical year, seven of which must transpire before the commencement of the year of Jubilee; consequently this Jubilee year returned every half century or every fiftieth year, when *all* property was restored to the original owners or their heirs; thus Levitical law decidedly proves and establishes, beyond the possibility of a doubt, that slavery could not be forever.

Nehemiah, v., 8. We read thus, "We, after our ability, have *redeemed* our brethren the Jews." In the xvii. of Genesis and in the xxv. of Leviticus, we have the same Hebrew word *kaaninou*, which is in those places translated "bought," but which means *we have redeemed*, because the laws of the Hebrews did not allow of a traffic in slaves nor to consider them as such: they were acts of mercy; the law of the stranger was the same as the law of the native, to *redeem* them from the law of their captors, for which redemption they were *hired* for the term of six years, or till the Sabbatical year. We find in the present version of our Bibles that the Hebrew word *tiknou* is rendered "*shall ye buy*" in the forty-fifth verse of the xxv. chapter of Leviticus, but it admits of different modes of expression, according to idiom, as is the case with *all* other words in *all* languages, and which is as well known to Amos Kendall as to any other grammarian; this word *tiknou* means to *acquire, procure, recover, redeem*, &c. &c. In Isaiah xi., 11, it is translated "*recover.*" "The Lord shall set his hand again the second time to *recover* the remnant of his people. In Deuteronomy, xxxii., 6, it is "that hath bought [Hebrew, *rescued*] *thee*," namely, from bondage and captivity; therefore the translation of this ought to be according to the Hebrew. "Of them shall ye procure servant and maiden." This literal mode of expounding Scripture has nothing of *slavery* about it. There might be six or seven versions of this text, and not one of them have the most remote idea to either servitude or slavery, and yet all be idiomatically correct.

As for the word *slavery*, we cannot find it; and in the Old Testament we find the word *slave* but once, and but once in the New Testament. But under what word soever we view servitude, whether under the Hebrew, Greek or Latin, serph, doulos, or verna, it means neither more nor less than a *labourer*. The word *slave* is commonly deduced from *sclavi*, Sclavonians, the name of a people, says Webster, who were conquered and made slaves by the Venitians.

The xvii. chapter of Genesis treats of God's *covenant* with Abram, and one part of that covenant was *circumcision*, upon which the chapter principally treats, but Mr. Kendall has dragged it into the slavery question, because Abraham circumcised those that he had *redeemed* from captivity with his money; they were no more slaves than Ishmael, for Ishmael and they were all circumcised or adopted as church members, and nothing is said about their being *slaves* or even *labourers*.

We will here present our brother Amos with our *religious* definition of *slavery*, namely, *slavery is sin*, and *sin is slavery*. We will also give him our moral and physical definition, which Amos views as the all-absorbing question of his imagination and his communication in your paper, namely, a slave is a man who is deprived of the three principal or primary articles expressed in the Declaration of our Independence, *life, liberty* and the *pursuit of happiness*, or the *legal right* of personal security, the *legal right* of personal liberty, and the *legal right* of possessing private property as a means of happiness. Under this definition, Abraham never "dealt in flesh and blood"; he never thus "*bought slaves with his money.*" Neither Abraham nor any other man can justly do it, or ever did it; and this, by the help of Blackstone, we can prove: there are but *three* ways in which *slaves* can possibly be made; *first* (jure gentium) from a state of captivity or war. The conqueror, says the pro-slavery man, had a right to take the life of his captive; and, having spared him that life, has a right to deal with him as he pleases. But this is an *untrue* position. A man has no right to *kill* his enemy, either by law, by nature or by *absolute necessity*, for the necessity did *not* exist, for the victor did not *kill* him, but made him prisoner. The *right* of thus making slaves depends on the supposed right of *slaughter*; therefore, *slaughter failing, slavery fails with it.* The *second* (jure civili) is when a man *sells himself* (as we have defined a slave in the modern sense of the laws of slave States) to another; that is, contracts to serve another or labour for another during his natural life; but when this sale is applied to the strict definition of slavery, we find that it also is *impossible* justly to exist. Every sale implies a price, a quid pro quo, an equivalent given to the seller, in lieu of what he transfers to the *buyer*. But what equivalent can be given for life, liberty, &c., both of which, in absolute slavery, are held to be in the hands of the master and at his disposal? The slave's property also, the *very price* he *seems* to receive, devolves, ipso facto, to his master, the instant he becomes his slave. In this, therefore, the *buyer* gives nothing, and the *seller* receives nothing; of what validity, then, can a sale be which *destroys* the very principle upon which *all* sales are founded? The *third* is by being born slaves (servi nascuntur) or acquired by nature (jure naturæ); that is a negative kind of birth-right; but as this is built on the foundation of the two supposed former rights, it must fall together with them. If neither *captivity* nor the *sale of one's self* can, by the law of *nature* and *reason*, reduce the *parent* to slavery, much less can they reduce the *offspring*.

Without fear of confutation or even a rational contradiction, we humbly, yet unhesitatingly, assert that neither God, Nature, the *Bible* nor reason ever taught and inculcated so irrational and absurd a doctrine as slavery.

Joseph Wright, A.M., V.D.M.

ANOTHER BOOK MUTILATED.

Another act of mutilation by the Publishing Committee of the American Tract Society has just been brought to light. The act was committed upon that celebrated work, *Mammon; or, Covetousness the Sin of the Church*, by Rev. John Harris, author of *The Great Teacher* and other religious works. For years the religious public in the United States has been circulating the Tract Society's edition of that work without the slightest suspicion that it was not a complete copy, as it purported to be, of the original. Gould and Lincoln, of Boston, having published an edition of the work in 1837, some one took the pains to compare therewith the edition issued by the Tract Society, when the following discoveries were made, viz.:

On p. 78 of the Tract Society's edition, the author says of Covetousness, "Its history is the history of oppression in all ages. For centuries, Africa—one quarter of the globe—has been set apart to supply the monster with victims—thousands at a meal."

In the Boston edition, p. 79, we read, "Its history is the history of slavery and oppression in all ages. For centuries," &c.

Could anything be meaner than the omission of the word "slavery" in a case like this? The African slave trade the Tract Society could afford to denounce, but slavery, the *source* of that and every other traffic in human flesh, they spared in deference to the feelings of the evangelical slavebreeders of the South! But this is not all.

On p. 78 of the Tract Society's edition, the author proceeds to describe the empire of covetousness: "And, at this moment, what a populous and gigantic empire can it boast! the mine, with its unnatural drudgery; the manufactory, with its swarms of squalid misery; the plantation, the market, and the exchange, with their furrowed and care-worn countenances—these are only specimens of its more menial offices and subjects." The passage, as Mr. Harris wrote it, stood thus: "The mine, with its natural drudgery; the manufactory, with its *forms* of squalid misery; the plantation, WITH ITS IMBRUTED GANGS! and the market and exchange, with their furrowed and care-worn countenances."

"The plantation with its *imbruted gangs*" was a phrase too rugged for the delicate stomachs of the evangelical thimble-riggers of the Tract Society. It would offend their masters, the slaveholders, and so it must be omitted!

The Independent, while it exposes this villany of the Tract Society, stultifies itself by admitting them to be true Christians, worthy to be reelected to the offices they now hold!

CONGRESS.

In the Senate, on the 2d instant, Mr. Fessenden, of Maine, made a pacific speech on the questions at issue between the United States and Great Britain. He exhibited no sympathy for American fillibusters. Messrs. Bell and Crittenden, between whom warm words had passed on the previous day, settled their quarrel by mutual apologies. On the 3d, Mr. Collamer, of Vermont, commenced his speech on the Kansas question, in reply to Douglas, of Illinois, and in defence of the minority Report from the Territorial Committee. His speech, which, on account of the delicate state of his health, was not finished till the next day (the 4th), produced a very marked impression. The correspondent of the *Evening Post* says:

"Judge Collamer's speech, which occupied two days, was an unanswerable and complete refutation of the fallacies employed by Mr. Douglas in his majority Report, to justify the principles of the Nebraska bill and the policy of the Administration in reference to the people of Kansas. Those fallacies are in many cases patent to the dullest comprehension, but nevertheless one could not help wondering at the number and size of the rents which the 'envious Casca' made in the report embodying them. And the whole thing was done in such excellent good humour, and the blows, one after another, told so effectively upon that unfortunate document, that finally Senators were less surprised at its easy demolition than at the fact that so flimsy a fabric had ever been put together.

"Judge Collamer, who, by the way, was the Postmaster-General under Taylor's administration, is a gray-headed, sleepy, judicial-looking personage, with a rather clumsy delivery; but the blunt carelessness of his phrases in the present instance furnished a sort of cover and excuse for some of the hardest hits that have yet been given to Douglas and his friends. These hits seemed at first purely accidental, and were taken in good part by his opponents, but they kept coming so fast and so pat that by and by they produced a general flutter on the other side. Douglas would begin to stir and converse with his friends, and finally interrupt the speaker, who would always sit down and listen with the utmost composure to the question. When this was over, he would rise again, Antæus fashion, and, without the least excitement or apparent intention of hurting anybody, hit his antagonist another still harder blow. Then he would pause, and, cocking up his eye, which would twinkle and brighten with suppressed fun, look at his friend from Illinois, as if to inquire whether he wanted more of the same sort.

"That Douglas was conscious of his discomfiture was evident from the nature of his reply. Eluding the discussion of Judge Collamer's main positions, he branched off into an electioneering harangue, charging those who resisted the doings of the spurious Missouri Legislature of Kansas with opposing the laws of the United States. He particularly denounced the 'Black Republicans,' who, he said, had come to Congress with the purpose of repealing the Fugitive Slave law and restoring the Missouri Compromise, but who are now merely insisting on the immediate admission of Kansas. Here, as his remarks became more and more *mal aprcpos* and unsenatorial, he became more loud-voiced: 'Your Abolition and Know-Nothing party (pointing to the other side of the House) are backing down; you are lowering the black flag, and I mean to hold you up to it.' This sentiment (which I give as nearly as I remember it) was uttered with an energy that drew down applause from the galleries, for whose benefit it was doubtless intended, and thereupon Douglas concluded, apparently satisfied with the result of his eloquence."

The following is from the report of the Senate proceedings on the 7th:

Mr. Cass—I desire to present a memorial from persons composing the self-styled Legislature of Kansas, and move its reference to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. Seward—Which of them?

Mr. Cass—The Honourable Senator understands just as well as if I told him.

Mr. Seward—I desire to know from my honourable friend from Michigan, whether the memorial he presents is a memorial which purports to come from the Territorial Legislature of Kansas, organized under the act of Congress, as I am led to infer from the manner in which he describes it, or whether it is a memorial from the Provisional Legislature of the new State of Kansas.

Mr. Cass—I will answer the Senator if he says he don't know. If he does not say that, I have no further answer to make (laughter).

Mr. Seward—Well, let it go. I have no concessions to make.

Mr. Hale (to Mr. Cass)—Very well done, General. I never knew you to do better (laughter).

Mr. Cass moved that the report be printed, but the question was postponed.

Mr. Geyer, of Missouri, then addressed the Senate on Kansas affairs, taking, of course, the Southern view of the question.

In the House, on Saturday, Gen. Granger, representing the Syracuse District, produced no little excitement by a bold and energetic speech, in which he avowed essentially the Constitutional views of Gerrit Smith. H. G. writes to *The Tribune* as follows:

"The speech of Gen. A. P. Granger in the House today was, in its character and influences, a striking exemplification of the power of directness, purpose, correctness and common sense. We have had many graceful orations this session in either House, by men of liberal education, thorough political training and consummate oratory, to which the curious or unemployed listened for a few moments, turned to a neighbour and observed, 'He is doing very well,' or 'That was neatly put,' and sauntered off to look at the paintings in the Rotunda, or chat with some fair acquaintance in the gallery. But to-day there arose in the House a plain, unassuming Member, who has passed the meridian of life without ever till now sitting in a legislative hall or filling a prominent station, who is not a fluent speaker and makes no effort at oratorical display, and who had been three months in the House without claiming its attention for more than fifteen minutes in all. Yet, from the moment he began to speak, all were resolute to stay and eager to hear; and, though the boldness and novelty of his positions excited some manifestations of dissent and even of derision, while Southern gladiators were on the alert to make party capital out of his views and statements, yet he was heard with absorbed attention to the end.

"And well he might be; for he travelled in no beaten track, said what had not been said before him, and used no more words than were needed to set forth his convictions. Such speakers, who meditate what they say and how most clearly and tersely to say it, will never lack attentive auditors.

"Forty times this Session, as at many former Sessions, we have had speeches which coolly assumed that slavery is under the special protection of the Federal Constitution—that this was a controlling purpose with the framers of that instrument—that whatever militates against slavery wars on the spirit of the Constitution. From the general tenor of the Nebraska speeches, one might fairly infer that, but for the need of fortifying slavery, there would have been no Constitution. But Gen. Granger met all this to-day by a plump denial of the alleged pro-slavery character of the National Charter. On the contrary, he maintained that the Constitution, in several of its fundamental provisions, secures liberty to every innocent human being, and so forbids the enslavement of any. No one who follows Gen. Granger's citations and arguments can doubt that, if this were the constitution of some forgotten republic of antiquity just recovered and submitted to learned publicists to determine its true character, they must unanimously pronounce it incompatible with the existence of slavery. We can only make it pro-slavery by considering who were its framers, by whom they were elected and what must have been their intent; for if we were to interpret the Constitution by itself alone, we must understand it as Gen. Granger does. And that, a generation hence, when public sentiment shall have been enlightened and purified, may very probably be the general interpretation. Let the American People come to hate slavery as they ought, and we shall need no Abolition acts, for the Judiciary will deal with it as Portia did with Shylock's 'pound of flesh.' There must always be law enough in a Republic to sweep away slavery whenever the Judges can afford to discern and apply it.

"Gen. Granger's speech will be the cause of many others, and skilful efforts will be made to hold the 'Black Republicans' responsible for it. I trust these will insure it a wide circulation at the South."

As the Constitution is *not* that "of some forgotten republic of antiquity," but of a nation of slaveholders and slavebreeders, and as it cannot be fairly interpreted in forgetfulness of this fact, we must deem Gen. Granger's construction erroneous. Nevertheless, we care not how soon the North adopts that construction, since the effort to enforce it would be followed either by submission on the part of the slaveholders or a dissolution of the Union—in all probability the latter.

On the 7th, on motion of Humphrey Marshall, of Ky., the Committee on Foreign Affairs were instructed to inquire into the expediency of declaring the engagement of American vessels in the Chinese Cooly trade to be illegal, and a sufficient cause of forfeiture to the captors of the ship engaged therein.

On motion of Mr. Pringle, it was resolved that the President be requested to communicate what information he may possess in regard to citizens of the United States being engaged in the slave trade or in the transportation in American ships of Coolies from China to Cuba and other countries, with the intention of placing or continuing them in a state of slavery or servitude; and whether such traffic is not, in his opinion, a violation of the spirit of existing treaties, rendering those engaged in it liable to indictment for piracy; and especially that he be requested to communicate to this House the facts and circumstances attending the shipment from China of some five hundred Coolies in the ship Sea Witch, of the City of New York, lately wrecked on the coast of Cuba.

On the same day Mr. Keitt, of South Carolina, made a speech on political affairs, calling on the Democratic party and the conservatives of the North to crush the aggressive spirit of fanaticism directed against the South. He maintained that the Presidential fight will be confined to the Democratic and Republican parties. There can be but two flags—the American organization being out of the question. The people will accept only one great issue at a time. The contest must turn on the Nebraska bill, the Democrats having accepted that issue.

KANSAS.

According to the latest accounts from Kansas, immigrants were beginning to arrive in considerable numbers both from the slave and the free States, and there are reports of still larger parties on their way. A letter to *The Times*, from Lawrence, dated March 27th, says:

"Emigration from the Southern and Eastern States has already commenced—a few drops before a plentiful shower. Two gentlemen arrived to-day from the State of Virginia, who report that 1,500 will emigrate from that State to this sometime during the present season. A few gentlemen from Kentucky report a larger number just on the eve of departure from that State, destined for Kansas. A gentleman from Wisconsin states that about 2,000 families will emigrate to Kansas from that State and so on. All prophesy a tremendous emigration to this State from different quarters of the Union before next January. If reports are not very much exaggerated, Kansas will be a very populous State by the time the next President takes his seat, and Senator Douglas's alleged opposition to our admission into the Union (a want of sufficient population) will be done away with."

A correspondent of the same paper, writing from Alabama, says:

"Of Kansas news I have small store to communicate. South Carolina is the only State of the South that exhibits any interest in its fate. We are permitted to know nothing, save that committees are appointed and resolutions passed; one might apprehend serious results from so much talk, had not the chivalry a reputation for wordy demonstrations. Before you get this, Col. Burford will have set out with his valorous five hundred, if he gets them. Some, who pretend to know, think he will do well to get together a company of three or four hundred. The expedition is a military one, with officers and a set of regulations. They carry no visible arms, however, that no offence may be given to the Government! They propose to supply themselves at St. Louis. They go direct to Lecompton, the gathering point of Southern emigrants.

"There really is no enthusiasm in this State in regard to this Kansas business. One of Burford's mouthpieces stated, in a pathetic speech, that in only two places within a considerable portion of the State over which he had travelled did the people enter zealously into the work of making Kansas a Southern State. Two reasons are alleged by intelligent Southerners for this apathy; it is believed to be a speculation on the part of Burford, and as such has no claim to their sympathy; the character of those who form this company is not satisfactory. Many of them are worthless characters at home and cannot be expected to be better in Kansas. A truer reason probably is, that the people clearly understand that the whole thing is not creditable to the South—is a shameless trick of political gamesters. Many concede that it ought to be a Free State; many more are persuaded that it will be. Whatever else may be attributed to Southern character, a profound dissimulation, downright deception, does not belong to it. Hence, with the facts before them, they cannot, and will not, enter heartily upon this enterprise of imposing upon Kansas the long train of evils that follow in the footsteps of oppression."

It will be seen by the following extract from the correspondence of the St. Louis *Republican* that the tools of the Administration have begun their work of indicting and trying the officers of the State government for treason.

"Palermo, K. T., March 25, 1856.

"The Legislature of Topeka was a miserable and ludicrous abortion, and its members are hiding themselves from judicial processes, like frightened ostriches. Some have fled to Iowa, some to Missouri, and the rest are hiding themselves in bushes, in the vain hope of security. The Grand Juries of the Circuit Court, under the instruction of Judge Lecompte, have indicted not only the members, but all the judges of election; and it is the intention of his Honour, at his term in Douglas, which begins next week, to have bills found against Gov. Robinson, Lieutenant-Governor Roberts, and all the executive officers.

"It is thought, by some, that when the Sheriff enters Lawrence to arrest these functionaries there will be resistance and bloodshed; but I apprehend nothing of the kind. The farcical attempt to hold a Legislature and the ridiculous pretensions that have been made to amend the laws of the Territory and to set up an independent government, which should supercede the present, have disgusted many of their own party, who see the absurdity and utter futility of all such efforts, and are determined henceforth to recognise the existing authorities."

A COMPLIMENT TO THE COLOURED PEOPLE.

To the Editors of The Anti-Slavery Standard.

During the sessions of the Committee appointed by the Legislature to look into the condition of tenement houses in this city, one of the Committee said: "I am not an Abolitionist; but I tell you what it is, gentlemen, if I were to build tenement houses in New York, I should get coloured tenants, if I could. They are more cleanly in their habits than the Irish, or a majority of the poorer class of Americans. I have found but very few, in the course of our investigations, who were not neat. It matters not how poor they are, they are generally clean." The other members of the Committee who were present seemed to assent to the remark.

If this is true—and we have no reason to question it—it speaks volumes in favour of the coloured people of this city. Despised and trampled upon as they are, and generally very poor, would it be strange to find them living in filth? Indeed, is it not generally supposed that, instead of being the most cleanly, they are the most filthy of tenants? This opinion, which, we think, generally prevails, is not founded upon actual knowledge, but is an inference drawn from the fact that the coloured people are the most despised and oppressed class among us. This being known, people at once come to the conclusion that filth and degradation must, of course, go hand in hand with the poverty.

We are inclined to think that great injustice is done the free coloured people of the North, in the estimate which is placed upon their worth. It is a wonder to us that they do as well as they do, surrounded as they are by an iron wall of prejudice. They are the representatives of a race whom we wrong and despise; and none are so slow to do justice to an injured people as they who inflict the injury.

Open Eye.

Hon. J. R. Buchanan is perhaps the most prominent candidate for the Presidential nomination of the Democratic National Convention, to be held in Cincinnati in June next. Some of the Northern Democrats, it is understood, have been urging his nomination on the ground that, as he has been out of the country during the Nebraska struggle and is not directly identified with the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, he would command a more hearty support at the North than either of his competitors. If any tender-footed Democrats at the North have flattered themselves that their Southern masters would allow them to have, in the person of Mr. Buchanan, a candidate not openly pledged to the latest devices of the Slave Power, they may be undeceived by the following extract of a letter from that gentleman to a Southern politician, dated the 28th of December last and published recently in the Washington *Union*. Mr. Buchanan, evidently determined that Pierce and Douglas shall have no advantage over him on the score of servility to the slaveholders, says:

"The question has been settled by Congress, and this settlement should be inflexibly maintained. The Missouri Compromise is gone, and gone forever. But no assault should be made upon those Democrats who maintained it, provided they are now willing in good faith to maintain the settlement as it exists. Such an understanding is wise and just in itself.

"It is well known how I laboured, in company with Southern men, to have this line extended to the Pacific Ocean. But it has departed. The time for it has passed away, and I verily believe that the best—nay, the only—mode now left of putting down the fanatical and restless spirit of Abolition at the North is to adhere to the existing settlement without the slightest thought or appearance of wavering, and without regarding any storm which may be raised against it."

Thus does "the favourite son of Pennsylvania," the representative of his country at St. James's, volunteer to prostrate himself at full length in the same ditch with his inferior rivals. Truly slavery is an inexorable master!

The Hero of Christiana.—We cut the following paragraph from a late number of the *Provincial* (C. W.) *Freeman*.

"We had the pleasure, on last Saturday, of taking by the hand Mr. Wm. Parker, the hero of Christiana. The memory of that conflict of *five* noble bondmen, unarmed, in protection of their wives and children, against an armed gang of thirty wretches in the employment of the United States, with the hireling *Kline*, of Philadelphia, and old Gorsuch, or Gorsooch, and son, slaveholders, of Maryland, at the head, will never be effaced.

"Mr. Parker is a slender man, rather tall, mild and forgiving in expression and character, but as decisive as death, as determined as a hurricane, and as brave as a Dessaline. A hundred such villains as Kline, of Pennsylvania, would be made to tremble and quake before the masterly eye of such a man as Mr. Parker. Grant that his manly arm could have reached the cowardly breasts of the whole thirty who assailed him at the time, instead of only *two!* His ever faithful wife suffered many privations till she reached him; but they are now happy in their *own* domestic abode, under protection of the British Lion."

Littell's Living Age, No. 620, opens with *Blackwood's* caustic review of Parton's Life of Horace Greeley and Pray's Life of James Gordon Bennett, under the head of "Biography gone Mad." The article, we suspect, is from the pen of some American writer, who takes a malignant satisfaction in showing his hostility to Mr. Greeley by putting him into bad company. We notice also Part 3d of "Kate Coventry," a very charming story from *Fraser*. New York: 343 Broadway.

The *Pennsylvanian*, the organ of Buchanan, has read the Hon. John Hickman—member of Congress from the Chester and Delaware District—out of the Democratic party for the unpardonable sin of refusing to make himself a party to the designs of the Administration in relation to Kansas. Mr. Hickman was the author of the Report of the Committee on Contested Elections giving the reasons for asking of the House the power to send for persons and papers in the case of Reeder. His speech in defence of the doctrines of the Report, delivered at the close of the debate, immediately before the final vote, made the slaveholders writhe like eels in a pot of vinegar. Though heretofore a strict party Democrat, and far from being an Abolitionist even now, he could not sanction the fraud and violence of the Border Ruffians, nor aid in stifling inquiry in relation to their conduct. Independence like this must of course be punished, in order to deter others from following the example. The slaveholders rule the Democratic party by essentially the discipline which they enforce on the plantation. A refractory democrat, like an unruly slave, must be "subdued."

Postal Reform.—Two public meetings, composed of influential citizens, have recently been held in this city for the purpose of promoting a reform in the United States Postal system. After careful consideration, a memorial to Congress has been agreed upon, asking that body to pass a law embracing the following particulars:

A Uniform Postage of Two Cents on all letters not exceeding half an ounce in weight, throughout the United States; and a cheap, uniform rate for printed matter.

Receiving Houses and Letter Carriers in all cities and principal towns, without extra charge.

Money Orders for sums not exceeding twenty-five dollars, to be drawn by the principal Post-Offices on each other.

A Uniform and Low Rate of Ocean Postage between the United States and foreign countries.

The Postage on all Government Documents and Franked Matter to be paid out of the Treasury.

The Abolition of Compulsory Pre-payment, and double postage on all mail matter not pre-paid.

The Return of all Dead Letters to the writers, and, whenever possible, without opening.

Copies of the memorial are now in circulation for signatures, and it is hoped that the desired law may be passed by the present Congress. To secure this result, however, extensive effort will be required, and we hope our readers will not fail to sign and circulate petitions.

Prejudice Conquered.—Among the seceders from the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1840, ostensibly on account of "the confounded woman question," no man exhibited more bitterness of feeling than the Rev. Nathaniel Colver, then of Boston, afterwards of Detroit, now of Cincinnati. He could not endure the appointment of a woman to serve on a Committee, and a speech from one of the sex so shocked his veneration for St. Paul (as popularly interpreted) as to throw him into a spasm of holy indignation. Recently, however, he went upon the same platform with Lucy Stone Blackwell and followed her in an anti-slavery speech! Time works wonders. The New Organization manifestos of 1839–40, if read by their authors in the light of the present day, would make them blush for their folly if they did not cause them to repent of their treachery to the cause and their injustice toward its faithful advocates.

Application of Slave Law.—A telegraphic despatch from Norfolk, Va., dated the 8th inst., says: "The Captain and crew of the schooner Maryland, of New York, have been seized and the vessel brought from Hampton Roads, for refusing to submit to a search for slaves under the law recently passed. Upon the refusal of the Captain to allow his vessel to be searched, a company of military was sent on board. Great excitement exists, as it is believed there are slaves concealed in the vessel. The Captain and crew have been consigned to prison."

This seizure is in pursuance of the law recently enacted by the Legislature of Virginia, the provisions of which were published in The Standard of March 29th. Whether the Captain had slaves on board his vessel, or merely resisted the search in order to test the constitutionality of the law, does not appear.

Rhode Island Anti-Slavery Convention.—An error occured in the publication of the notice of this Convention in last week's Standard, which, as it might otherwise lead to mistakes on the part of some of our Rhode Island readers, we hasten to correct. The Convention is to commence, not on Saturday *evening*, as was announced last week, but on Saturday *morning*, at 10 o'clock. The official notice this week will be found correct.

We are sure that the faithful Abolitionists of Rhode Island will eagerly embrace this opportunity of meeting together for consultation in regard to the great question of Slavery. The speakers advertised to be present are among the most eloquent and devoted of all the champions of freedom, and we cannot doubt that multitudes will flock together to listen to their glowing words.

Connecticut, at the election on Monday last, chose a Legislature opposed in both branches to the National Administration. The Senate is said to stand 12 Republican, or Fusion, to 9 Democratic; the House 127 Republican to 99 Democratic. This fixes the fate of Mr. Toucey, who now misrepresents the State in the United States Senate. His term will expire on the 4th of March next, when he will doubtless be superseded by a Republican.

Summary.

Lecture.—A lady named Delphine P. Barker lectured in Chicago, on Saturday evening last, against Woman's Rights.—*Milwaukee Free Democrat*.

The New York Central College, Magrawville, Cortlandt County, commenced its Spring term on the 5th inst. Students of both sexes, and every variety of complexion, are received. This college is at present entirely dependent upon its own resources.

Dr. Graham, of New Orleans, who was sentenced to the Sing Sing prison, a year ago, for a term of seven years, for the murder of Col. Loring at the St. Nicholas Hotel, has been pardoned by Gov. Clark, upon the application of distinguished citizens, on account of the feeble state of his health.

The Kansas Committee has left Washington for Kansas. Mr. Fogg, the editor of the New-Hampshire *Independent Democrat*, was its chief clerk; Mr. Hanscomb, of Massachusetts, second clerk; Mr. Lord, of Baltimore, phonographer. It made no request for military protection, and, we presume, will need none.

Refusal to Install.—The Baptist Church in Lima, Ind., lately refused to install the Rev. Mr. Fish, who had warmly been approved otherwise, because he was in favour of the Baptist Missionary Union, which was denounced and is now growingly regarded as a pro-slavery institution after the type of the American Tract Society.

The Jackson *Mississippian* says that Mississippi "owes a debt to the Pierce Administration," and Prentice of the Louisville *Journal* wants to know whether the State means to issue bonds to secure its payment, and, if so, what will probably be their market value? This is a hard hit at Mississippi for her rascality in repudiating her honest debts.

Tarred and Feathered.—We learn from the Canton (Miss.) *Commonwealth* that Charles Wheelock, by trade a plasterer, was tarred and feathered in that place on the night of the 19th ult. and then ordered to vamose the ranche. It appears that his offence was tampering with slaves and propagating abolition sentiments.

Another Outrage on the Eighth Avenue Railroad.—On Wednesday a respectable coloured young woman entered one of the cars at the upper end of Eighth Avenue, and, during the progress of the car, was violently ejected by the Conductor. She afterward got into another car, but was also ejected from it in the same way. The young woman's name is Maria D. Church, and is employed in the family of J. W. Tripp, Esq.—*Tribune*.

The Slaver Falmouth.—This vessel still lies at the Navy Yard. No one has appeared yet to confess himself as her owner. On Tuesday next—unless claimants present themselves in the meanwhile, which seems altogether unlikely—the vessel will be advertised for sale at public auction. The ship with her cargo is estimated at $5,500. Half the proceeds of the sale go to the United States Marshals who captured her, and the residue to the Government.—*Times, 5th*.

Where are the living arguments in favour of eternal punishment? We defy any one to produce them.—*Spiritual Telegraph*.

You may defy other people, *Mr. Telegraph;* but you must not defy *us*. We can furnish at least five living arguments of the sort which you desire. Here they are: Shannon, Pierce, Stringfellow, Atchison, Douglas.—*Cleveland Leader*.

Effects of Border Ruffianism.—Barbour and Brown were among the victims of Border Ruffianism. A colporteur of the Tract Society, writing from Lawrence, says: "I was to-day in the neighbourhood where resides the widow of the martyred Barbour. She is as inconsolable as ever, and it is the opinion of her neighbours that she will grieve herself to death. The widow of the martyred Brown is a raving maniac, made so by intense grief."

Emancipation in Jamaica.—A large audience assembled last evening, at the Music Hall, to hear Rev. Henry H. Garnett, a resident of Jamaica, and a missionary of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, on the subject of emancipation in Jamaica. The lecturer gave a sketch of the origin of slavery in that island, of the condition of slaveholders there just previous to the act of emancipation, and of the happy results of emancipation, as he knew from personal observation.—*Boston Telegraph, 4th*.

Fusion of the two Douglases.—A correspondent writing to us from Lawrence, K. T., says, that at a township meeting on the 8th of March, in the County of Douglas, the Free State men got a committee to report a suitable name for the town. "Sumner" was the one chosen. "Who's Sumner?" inquired the Missourians. "General Sumner of the Revolution—a South Carolinian." "All right—we go him." The coolness of the joke which put upon the ruffians the name of an anti-slavery Senator from Massachusetts was positive heat, compared with the effrontry which then fused the two Douglases, Steve and Fred. Taking the latter half of the Illinois Douglas's name, and the first of the Rochester one, these Free State men re-christened their County—and Sumner township is now in "Fred Douglass" County.—*Albany Journal*.

A Slave Beat to Death.—We learn from Grenada, Miss., that Mr. H. Talbert, of that place, had a negro whipped to death by his overseer, on Thursday or Friday last. It appears the negro became guilty of some offence, for which his overseer attempted to chastise him, when he ran away, but was caught, perhaps the same evening. The overseer whipped the negro very severely, and repeated it until the negro was found to be dying, when the overseer left for "parts unknown."—*Natchez Courier*.

Family of Slaves Emancipated.—We are informed that a wealthy cotton-planter from Tishomingo County, Mississippi, named Josiah Sittles, is in Hamilton, Butler County, Ohio, with a family of nine slaves, which he purposes to set free. He also intends to educate and otherwise prepare them to sustain properly their new relation to society. The family consists of a mother, with six sons and two daughters. Three of the boys are good mechanics, and another acted as an overseer. Mr. Sittles is still the owner of many slaves.—*Cincinnati Commercial*.

Festivities in Washington.—Hon. Francis P. Blair entertained a large party at his residence, Silver Spring, Md., on Saturday. Among those present were Messrs. Seward, Houston, Banks, Washburn of Me., Colfax, E. P. Morgan of New York, Edwards of New York, Fogg of New Hampshire.

Dr. Bayley entertained a party at his residence in Washington, on Saturday evening. Among those present were Messrs. Fremont, Sumner, Banks, Giddings, Rev. Starr King, Tappan, of New Hampshire, Judge Piatt of Cincinnati, and his lady, the "J. B." correspondent of the New York *Tribune*.

A Good Suggestion.—*Messrs. Editors:* Since you have predicted the possible and probable declination of Mr. Fillmore, and that, too, upon seemingly strong grounds, I beg that you will insert the following suggestion for the benefit of the Know-Nothings, in the event of that deplorable contingency, namely, that if Mr. Fillmore should decline, George Washington Parke Custis shall be substituted in his stead, so that the ticket shall then read,

FOR PRESIDENT,
GEORGE WASHINGTON parke custis;
FOR VICE-PRESIDENT,
ANDREW JACKSON donelson.

—*Richmond Enquirer*.

Lynch Law in Virginia.—A man named Wm. Hornbeck, living in Lewis County, Virginia, for the alleged ill-treatment of his family, was lynched by the young men in the neighbourhood, one night last week. The Weston *Herald* says: He was taken, a few nights since, by a party of men, who stripped him of his clothing, and rode him for a length of time in that condition on a rail; he was then taken to a briar patch and made to run through it. Whenever he evinced a disposition to move less swiftly, a stout paddle, bored through with augur holes, was applied, which accelerated his movements astonishingly. This exercise being over, a coat of tar and feathers was applied, which Mr. Hornbeck was made to wear much against his will. During this operation he tried to faint, but the paddle soon restored him to consciousness, after which he was left alone in his glory.

Mr. Cass and his old Newspapers.—It is a common practice for Mr. Cass to make the Senate of the United States a place in which to discuss personal affairs. He labours under the singular hallucination that his opinions are of consequence to the world. His industrious attention in rising in his seat "to make a personal explanation," or to read acrimonious articles from the London *Times*, has become a nuisance; and we are glad to learn that Mr. Hale treated the matter with the ridicule it deserved. Mr. Cass undoubtedly has some ability; but he has no influence. He has exhibited, on all occasions, such a want of decision and nerve, that he is now an object of commiseration.

Mr. Cass does not always confine himself to foreign newspapers; but, by way of variety, the public are now and then favoured with "a personal explanation" about some article in American newspapers, referring in severe terms to the ex-Presidential candidate.—*Boston Atlas*.

An Irishman Dissolving the Union.—By way of illustrating the supreme folly of the cry about the dissolution of the Union, Lieut. Gov. Ford related, the other evening, in his own inimitable manner, the following capital story:

"Dissolve the Union!" said Ford; "I should like to see them attempt to dissolve the Union. Why, this silly cry reminds me of an Irishman who went down into a well to clean it out. When he was through, he made the signal to be hauled up. His companions, who were determined to have a joke at his expense, hauled him up about half way and then stopped. There he hung—no way to get up—no safe way to get down, if that were desirable. He begged and entreated, but it was of no use. He stormed and raved, but it did no good. At last he sung out, 'Haul me out, ye spalpeens, or, by the piper that played before Moses, I'll be after cutting the rope!'

"Let them cut the rope, if they like the plunge," was Ford's application of the story.

Another Pro-Slavery Scheme.—The Southern *Standard*, published at Charleston, S. C., deserves the palm for having conceived the most gigantic of all the schemes of fillibusterism and "manifest destiny" yet projected. In a late article it boldly advocates the seizure of Cuba, the conquest of Hayti, and the entering into a close alliance with Brazil to control the Amazon, the West Indies, and the rest of the American tropical regions. It also defends the re-establishment of the African slave trade, as a measure of "wise and Christian philanthropy." The *Standard* thinks that with Brazil and the United States united in the common policy of cultivating the tropics by slave labour, the wealth amassed would be so great, and the power of the nation rise to such a pitch, that the whole world might be defied. The plan has, at least, the merit of being colossal. No Roman Emperor, in the plentitude of his ambition, ever conceived a project more stupendous. Yet there is nothing strange in this; for the power which threatens to conquer the United States may be expected to attempt the conquest of the world.—*Cleveland Leader*.

Boy Torn to Pieces by a Cuban Bloodhound.—Ephraim Whitehead, son of R. Whitehead, who lives on Cedar street, was missing on Saturday about 11 o'clock. After dinner the family became alarmed, and search was instituted for him. A nephew of Whitehead discovered the boy in a field, about twenty rods from the house, nearly dead, having been attacked and torn in a most awful manner by a bloodhound slut, owned in the neighbourhood. The poor little fellow lived only half an hour after he was found. When he was discovered, the question was asked whether it was the bloodhound that attacked him. He had barely strength enough to articulate "Yes." The boy was about eight years old, and was a general favourite with the family. The hound is of the same breed used by Southern slaveholders to hunt runaway slaves. She was immediately killed. We hope that this sad event will teach and enforce the necessity of killing all ferocious dogs, as it is dangerous to the safety of women and children to have such animals in a thickly populated city like ours.—*Cleveland Plaindealer*.

The Coloured Population of Cincinnati.—The Cincinnati *Sun* says that the coloured people of that city number about 5,000 souls. Of their occupations and wealth it is stated—there are five physicians, one of whom has a very large practice among both whites and blacks; twelve grocers; thirty music and school teachers; five daguerreotypists; one patent roofer; five brick-layers and stone-masons; two trunk-makers; twelve dealers in market; five or six boot and shoe-makers; a number of excellent tailors, blacksmiths and carpenters; and one hundred milliners, dress-makers, shirt-makers and tailoresses. Among them are Henry Boyd, one of the largest and best cabinet manufacturers in the city, who is worth at least $40,000; J. P. Ball, R. G. Ball and J. C. Ball, who take as fine daguerreotypes as are taken in the world, and who are worth $30,000 at least. The names of 13 of these coloured people are given, whose property is valued at $10,000; three $6,000; five $5,000; one $4,000; one $3,000; one $9,000; one $8,000; one $12,000; one $14,000; six $15,000; four $20,000; five $30,000; two $40,000. The names of twenty five others are given, and it is stated that these and many others, whose names are not mentioned, have property ranging in value from three to twenty thousand dollars.—*North American*.

Nicaragua as it is.—A correspondent of the New York *Courier* gives a word of warning upon the manner that Americans are pressed into the Nicaraguan service by Walker and his coadjutors. He went out in the Northern Light with some other passengers. On getting to Virgin Bay, all who had tickets to that place were claimed as recruits for Walker, as accepting the Nicaraguan bounty, whether they had paid for the tickets themselves or not. The writer, who had no through ticket to California, was pressed in this manner by Walker's officials, who put a guard over him. On threatening to complain to the United States Government, he was released. But others who were forced ashore were not so fortunate, but were compelled, against their will and remonstrances, to go to Grenada, where, if they were not enticed into the army, they were made commissary clerks, so that they should be ready when wanted. He says the inhabitants hate the very name of American, regarding them all as fillibusters. Efforts are continually being made by the adherents of Walker to prevent communication between passengers returning from Nicaragua and those going there, and exorbitant charges for conveyance are made to those who are dissatisfied and wish to return to the United States, $35 being charged for passage down the San Juan river to such persons, when the fare to others is but $10.

Justice to a Brave Man.—*The Standard* of last week mentioned an account of the brutal murder of a slave at Independence, Missouri. The slave was described as a "desperate character." The story, as told by a Kansas paper, has quite another face:

A black man, belonging to the estate of Jabez Smith, of Independence, Mo., was brutally *murdered*, a few days ago. The black man had a wife and thirteen children. He had been sold several times to go South, but had refused to be arrested; on that account he still remained in Independence. On the day of his slaughter he was invited into a store, and while there an attempt was made to handcuff him, but he broke away from his pursuers, and fled into the street. He was followed and fired upon, several shots hitting him in the leg, shoulder, &c., and one passed through his body, in the region of the heart. He fell, and then was overtaken and kicked by his pursuers. They inquired if he would give up. "No!" was the response; and the kicking and beating was continued till after life was extinct. During the affray, he drew a pistol on a person, who attempted to stop him in the street, and this was the reason given for shooting him down. Our informant, who was in Independence at the time, states that, on the following day, an animated discussion was carried on in the streets, and in social circles, to know who should have the distinction of slaying the "insurgent," several persons claiming the honour.

Mr. Everett, the Unfortunate.—Edward Everett lectured in Richmond, Va., on Thursday evening, to an immense audience, at two dollars per ticket for each listener. He had a tremendous house and after he had got through his eulogy upon Washington, which takes some two hours, we understand, to finish, Gov. Wise of Only, near Onanock, and John Tyler, each made a long complimentary speech to the ship with her cargo is estimated at $5,500. Half the proceeds of the sale go to the United States Marshals who captured her, and the residue to the Government.—*Times, 5th*.

Where are the living arguments in favour of eternal punishment? We defy any one to produce them.—*Spiritual Telegraph*.

You may defy other people, *Mr. Telegraph;* but you must not defy *us*. We can furnish at least five living arguments of the sort which you desire. Here they are: Shannon, Pierce, Stringfellow, Atchison, Douglas.—*Cleveland Leader*.

Effects of Border Ruffianism.—Barbour and Brown were among the victims of Border Ruffianism. A colporteur of the Tract Society, writing from Lawrence, says: "I was to-day in the neighbourhood where resides the widow of the martyred Barbour. She is as inconsolable as ever, and it is the opinion of her neighbours that she will grieve herself to death. The widow of the martyred Brown is a raving maniac, made so by intense grief."

Emancipation in Jamaica.—A large audience assembled last evening, at the Music Hall, to hear Rev. Henry H. Garnett, a resident of Jamaica, and a missionary of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, on the subject of emancipation in Jamaica. The lecturer gave a sketch of the origin of slavery in that island, of the condition of slaveholders there just previous to the act of emancipation, and of the happy results of emancipation, as he knew from personal observation.—*Boston Telegraph, 4th*.

Fusion of the two Douglases.—A correspondent writing to us from Lawrence, K. T., says, that at a township meeting on the 8th of March, in the County of Douglas, the Free State men got a committee to report a suitable name for the town. "Sumner" was the one chosen. "Who's Sumner?" inquired the Missourians. "General Sumner of the Revolution—a South Carolinian." "All right—we go him." The coolness of the joke which put upon the ruffians the name of an anti-slavery Senator from Massachusetts was positive heat, compared with the effrontry which then fused the two Douglases, Steve and Fred. Taking the latter half of the Illinois Douglas's name, and the first of the Rochester one, these Free State men re-christened their County—and Sumner township is now in "Fred Douglass" County.—*Albany Journal*.

A Slave Beat to Death.—We learn from Grenada, Miss., that Mr. H. Talbert, of that place, had a negro whipped to death by his overseer, on Thursday or Friday last. It appears the negro became guilty of some offence, for which his overseer attempted to chastise him, when he ran away, but was caught, perhaps the same evening. The overseer whipped the negro very severely, and repeated it until the negro was found to be dying, when the overseer left for "parts unknown."—*Natchez Courier*.

Family of Slaves Emancipated.—We are informed that a wealthy cotton-planter from Tishomingo County, Mississippi, named Josiah Sittles, is in Hamilton, Butler County, Ohio, with a family of nine slaves, which he purposes to set free. He also intends to educate and otherwise prepare them to sustain properly their new relation to society. The family consists of a mother, with six sons and two daughters. Three of the boys are good mechanics, and another acted as an overseer. Mr. Sittles is still the owner of many slaves.—*Cincinnati Commercial*.

Festivities in Washington.—Hon. Francis P. Blair entertained a large party at his residence, Silver Spring, Md., on Saturday. Among those present were Messrs. Seward, Houston, Banks, Washburn of Me., Colfax, E. P. Morgan of New York, Edwards of New York, Fogg of New Hampshire.

Dr. Bayley entertained a party at his residence in Washington, on Saturday evening. Among those present were Messrs. Fremont, Sumner, Banks, Giddings, Rev. Starr King, Tappan, of New Hampshire, Judge Piatt of Cincinnati, and his lady, the "J. B." correspondent of the New York *Tribune*.

A Good Suggestion.—*Messrs. Editors:* Since you have predicted the possible and probable declination of Mr. Fillmore, and that, too, upon seemingly strong grounds, I beg that you will insert the following suggestion for the benefit of the Know-Nothings, in the event of that deplorable contingency, namely, that if Mr. Fillmore should decline, George Washington Parke Custis shall be substituted in his stead, so that the ticket shall then read,

FOR PRESIDENT,
GEORGE WASHINGTON parke custis;
FOR VICE-PRESIDENT,
ANDREW JACKSON donelson.

—*Richmond Enquirer*.

Lynch Law in Vir

Miscellaneous Department.

REVIEW OF WEBSTER'S SYSTEM.

From the United States Democratic Review for March.

AN AMERICAN DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. By Noah Webster. 1828—1853.

SOME five-and-twenty years have elapsed since this Dictionary was first issued; and, to its compiler and publishers, they have been years of success. The time for producing the work was fortunate. Our language had grown rapidly for a considerable period: its vocabulary was largely increased by the contributions of science, by numerous adoptions from foreign tongues, and by an accumulation of derivatives from our own established words; so that a well-digested record of the progress of the language was really needed. Besides, the parties in interest, following the suggestion of the title-page, had industriously cultivated an *Esprit-Americain* in behalf of the book, which materially aided its favourable reception.

If Webster had confined himself to recording such additions of words as usage had sanctioned, to a careful sifting of etymologies, and to his own valuable definitions, his work would have been as great an acquisition to literature as to his individual profit. But, unfortunately, * * * he added to his legitimate labour the gratuitous task of improving the orthography of the language.

True, language, like all things human, is mutable. So long as it continues to be spoken, it will continue to change. From the days of Johnson to the days of Webster, thousands of words had been added to the common stock, and many variations had taken place in the meaning of words. Spelling, also, had undergone some modifications. For example, the *k* of music, physic, etc., and the *u* of favour, honour, etc., had been gradually dropped by good writers, though probably without good reason; and thus orthography, too, was in a state of progress. This was an undesirable state; for it left the student without any absolute standard. And if the student chose to refine upon the matter, he would soon see that not only was there no absolute standard, but that the very principles of our orthography—its rules and its analogies—were exceedingly defective.

This is all true; but it is also true that discovering defects is one thing; curing them, another; and it is the fate of reformers, generally, to propose remedies that are worse than the disease. They can see that such and such wheels of the machine have an eccentric motion; but they cannot see that cutting away what they deem superfluous flanges may disturb other wheels that are regulated by that very eccentricity. A change which the reformer thinks will promote simplicity may happen to produce confusion; and, unless he fully understands the machinery, he is pretty certain to do mischief by meddling with it.

This would seem to be Webster's predicament. He aspired to a Newtonian law that would reconcile all orthographical inconsistencies; he produced certain arbitrary rules of his own creation that reconcile nothing, that are whimsically limited in their scope, and are ridiculous from their reciprocal contradictions.

Webster remarks that "the chief value of a dictionary consists in its definitions." Some one else remarks that "opinions differ." Yet it must be acknowledged that Webster's remark, as applied to *his own* dictionary, is not far from the truth. The vocabulary of his book has, certainly, the merit of amplitude. He says it "contains sixteen thousand words not to be found in any similar preceding work"; but when one opens the book in the middle, and finds, consecutively,

irremovability,	irremovable,
irremovably,	irremoval,
irremunerable,	irrenowned,
irreparability,	irreparable,
irreparableness,	irreparably,
irrepealability,	irrepealable,
irrepealableness,	irrepealably,
irrepentance,	

he may, perhaps, doubt whether "the value of the dictionary" increases in the direct ratio of its voluminousness. Webster's etymologies, too, are copious—probably more so than any preceding lexicographer's, in the proportion of three to one.; but as their genuineness is not always beyond question, their quantity is hardly a fair measure of their "value." The orthography of the dictionary requires a more careful consideration.

The principles—or rather the dogmas—of Webster's proposed reform are embodied in the following enumerated paragraphs:

1. Considering that the tendency of our language to greater simplicity and broader analogies ought to be watched and cherished with the utmost care, he felt that whenever a movement towards wider analogies and more general rules had advanced so far as to leave but few exceptions to impede its progress, those exceptions ought to be set aside at once and the analogy rendered complete.

2. We had numerous words derived from the French, originally ending in *re*, as cidre, chambre, etc. And, as these had gradually conformed to English spelling, until the number ending in *re* was reduced to fifteen or twenty, with their derivatives, it was necessary to complete the analogy at once by transposing the terminations of the remainder. Acre, massacre, and lucre, however, are necessary exceptions, since transposing their terminations would endanger their pronunciation.

3. We had many hundreds of primitives ending in a single consonant, whose derivatives were formed by the addition of *ing*, *ed*, *er*, etc., and in their derivatives this single consonant was doubled when the accent fell on it, as forget, forgetting; but it was not doubled when the accent fell on a preceding syllable, as garden, gardener. There were also about fifty words ending in *l*, in which the analogy was violated, as travel, traveller. It was necessary, therefore, at once to strike out the superfluous *l* from these fifty words. But the *ll* was retained in chancellor, metallurgy, crystalline, with their cognates, because they were derived directly from the Latin and Greek, cancellarius, metallum, and krystallos.

4. Expense, recompense, license, which formerly had a *c* in their last syllable, had since taken an *s*, because *s* is used in their derivatives, as expensive, etc. As in this instance, it was necessary to change only three words to complete the analogy, namely, defence, offence, and pretence, their *c* was at once replaced with an *s*, and they were written defense, offense, and pretense. It had been asked, why not spell fence in the same manner? And nothing is easier than the answer; the derivatives require the *c*; as fencing, etc., and therefore the *c* of fence is retained.

5. Foretel, instil, distil, fulfil should be written foretell, instill, etc., because their derivatives, foretelling, instilling, etc., are so written.

6. Dulness, fulness, skilful, wilful, must be written dullness, fullness, etc., because their primitives are so written, as dull, full, skill, will. *Walker* says there is no reason why we should not write dullness, fullness, skillful, and willful, as well as stiffness, gruffness, and crossness.

7. Such compounds as befall, miscall, install, forestall, inthrall, enroll, and their derivatives, befalling, miscalling, installing, forestalling, inthrallment, and enrollment, are spelled with the *ll*, to prevent a false pronunciation.

8. Mould and moult should be spelled mold and molt, because the *u* has been dropped or never was used in gold, bold, fold, colt.

9. Wo should be spelled woe, because doe, foe, hoe, toe, and all similar nouns of one syllable, are so spelled. The parts of speech other than nouns, as go, so, no, retain the termination in *o*, as, also, do nouns of more than one syllable, as motto, potato, tomato.

10. Practise, the verb, should be spelled practice, because the noun is so spelled. Drought should be spelled drouth, because it is extensively so pronounced. Height should be spelled hight, because it was so spelled by MILTON. Ton should be spelled tun, and molasses, molasses, because that spelling is more consistent with the etymologies. Contemporary should be spelled cotemporary, because it is more easily pronouced. Plough should be spelled plow, because that spelling more naturally represents the sound.

11. Verbs from the Greek *izo*, and others formed in analogy with them, have the termination in *ize*, as baptize, legalize, etc. Catechise and exorcise are exceptions. Verbs and some nouns, derived directly from the French and a few from other sources, have the termination in *ise*, as advertise, advise, affranchise, chastise, circumcise, comprise, compromise, criticise, demise, despise, devise, disfranchise, disguise, emprise, enfranchise, enterprise, exercise, merchandise, misprise, premise, reprise, revise, supervise, surmise, surprise.

These eleven paragraphs, dogmas, rules, or whatever they may be termed, form, with the exception of a few "instances" entirely too trivial to be discussed, the sum total of Webster's orthographical creed, presented substantially in his own words.

1. The assumptions of number one are characteristic and suggestive. They prophetically weigh and measure the lexicographer. Nobody can doubt what sort of orthography will follow such a preamble. The "tendencies" which it would puzzle any other philologist to discover, the complacent "*solicitude*" with which those tendencies are "*watched and cherished*," and the heroism which summarily removes impeding "*exceptions*," are consistent with each other and pleasant to look upon.

2. Webster found fifteen or twenty words derived from the French and retaining their original termination in *re*, "although numerous other words, of similar derivation and termination, had gradually conformed to English spelling"; that is, the *re* had been transposed to *er*, as cidre to cider, chambre to chamber, etc. What Webster means by the term "English spelling," in this connection, is not obvious: *re* is as consistent with any admitted or fixed principle of English orthography as *er*: but the reason why these fifteen or twenty words retained their original termination, and why Webster should have let them alone, is obvious enough to every one but himself, namely, that their *derivatives required it*. As Webster found the words, they stood thus:

theatre,	theatrical,
sepulchre,	sepulchral,
centre,	central,
lustre,	lustrous, etc., etc.;

as he left them, they stand thus:

theater,	theatrical,
sepulcher,	sepulchral,
center,	central,
luster,	lustrous, etc., etc.

that is, he transposed the termination of the primitive, to conform to *his rule*, and then retransposed it in the derivative, to conform to "English spelling." *His* derivatives should be

theaterical,
sepulcheral,
centeral,
lusterous, etc.

Acre, massacre, lucre, he says, "are necessary exceptions." Doubtless, they are "necessary" *to his rule*, and that proves his rule to be a bad one; it neither "promotes simplicity" nor "broadens analogy." When derivatives on the one hand, and pronunciations on the other, oppose the working of an arbitrary rule, a prudent man would withhold his rule. * * * In direct contradiction of this rule, Webster spells ogre with the original termination.

3. For reasons satisfactory to Webster—*ante*, rule number 3—it was necessary to strike out the "superfluous *l*" of travelling, "and about fifty similar words." If the precept in rule number 2 has any force, namely, that the spelling must not be altered when altering it endangers the pronunciation, some of these fifty changes will be found hazardous. For instance, as a matter of fact, and by orthoëpical construction,

shaveling,
starveling, etc.

are words of two syllables; yet, under this rule, Webster ordains that

shoveling,
traveling, etc.,

which have precisely the same orthoëpical construction, shall be pronounced in three syllables. Here, then, is arbitrary rule the second in direct conflict with arbitrary rule the first. Which must give way? But that is not all. Webster says that chancellor, metallurgy and crystalline retain the *ll* because they are derived directly from the Latin and Greek. This "because" may as well be investigated. The lexicographer bases an orthographical principle on his simple assertion of a fact; but that fact is, first, inherently improbable; secondly, is utterly beyond the assertor's knowledge; and, thirdly, would not support his position if it were true. 1. It is improbable. The three words necessarily came to the French before they were adopted by the English; and as krystallos changed into crystallinus on its journey through Rome, they all went "directly" from Italy to France; and our English ancestors had no occasion to go to Italy for what was already to be had by crossing the Channel. Moreover, the *h* of chancellor *proves* that *it* came "directly" from the French, and Webster *dis*-proves his own assertion of its derivation from cancellarius, by giving, in his own dictionary, chancelier as its etymology. 2. It is beyond the assertor's knowledge. Neither he nor his great-grandfather was *there* when the word was adopted; no human being can affirm, as truth, what is so remote and conjectural; and a vague and rash *guess* forms no apology, even, for such an affirmation. 3. If the words were "directly so derived," the fact would not justify Webster's excepting them from his rule. That rule is, inferentially—otherwise, it has no meaning whatever—that words "directly derived" always retain the *ll* of their originals. Yet, observe how Webster himself sets this rule at nought in this very dictionary:

excel,	spelled with one *l*,	is derived	from	excello;
dispel,	"	"	"	dispello;
repel,	"	"	"	repello;
libel,	"	"	"	libellus;
pupil,	"	"	"	pupillus;
compel,	"	"	"	compello;

and so forth, and so forth. Nor is this all. After Webster has expunged the "superfluous *l*" from his "fifty words," marvellous, counsellor, etc., in obedience to rule number 3, he proceeds, in defiance of the same rule, to spell, in his dictionary, as follows:

gravel (primitive),	lamel (primitive),
gravelly,	lamellar,
chapel (primitive),	lamellarly,
chapellany,	lamellate,
cancel (primitive),	lamellated,
cancellate,	lamelliferous,
cancellated,	etc., etc.
cancellation,	

and so on indefinitely. There is another point to be considered about rule number 3. Its phraseology seems to be plain, but Webster's practice confuses it. The rule *says* that when the accent falls on the final consonant of the primitive, it is to be doubled in the derivative, and not otherwise; as forget, forgetting, in the one case, and travel, traveler, in the other. Yet Webster spells

tranquil, tranquillity, etc.,

as if he were prepared to say that, though the accent does not fall on the final consonant of the primitive while it remains a primitive, yet, if that consonant takes the accent when the word becomes a derivative, it is still to be doubled. This would be interpreting Webster's rule with a large latitude in his favour, and it is an interpretation to which he is by no means entitled. Nevertheless, give him the full benefit of it, and then apply the rule, so construed, to his spelling of

civil,	civility,
legal,	legality,
frugal,	frugality, etc.

and then, for a counter-contradiction of his rule, where the final consonant of the primitive *is* accented, and the same consonant in the derivative is *not*, take his spelling of

excel,	excellent,

and the lexicographer's inconsistency approaches the sublime! It is to be observed that the spelling of the twenty-and-odd words here cited is correct in fact, but is not correct according to Webster's own rules.

4. Webster specifies license, among other words, as having been changed from licence "because the derivatives require the *s*." This affirmation is an extraordinary "license" for a lexicographer whose dictionary contains the following words:

license,	licentiate,
licensed,	licentiation,
licensing,	licentious,
licenser,	licentiously,
licensure,	licentiousness,

that is, four derivatives in which the *s* is used, and five where it is not. And this misstatement of the fact is material, because Webster makes it one of his points of justification in "changing the only three words that remain terminating in *ence*." But what does Webster mean by saying that pretence, offence and defence, are "the only three words that remain terminating in *ence*"? His own dictionary contains many other words "terminating in *ence*," the derivatives of which do not retain the *c*, all of which he leaves just as he finds them, in a state of absolute non-conformity to his rule. For example:

sentence,	sententious,
consequence,	consequential,
inference,	inferential,

and so on. If a direct answer could have been extorted from Webster, it would be pleasant to see his reply to this question: Since it was necessary to change defence into defense because defensive is spelled with an *s*, why should sentence remain unchanged, when its derivatives are spelled with a *t*? Webster says, "the question has been asked, why not spell *fence* with an *s*?" And he finds "nothing easier that the reply, that the *derivatives of fence require the c*." If this reply means anything, it means that the spelling of a derivative must control the spelling of its primitive: and if this *rule* has any force, it must be general in its application, and not restricted to such isolated cases as Webster's caprice may dictate. The reader will have occasion to keep this point in remembrance. Now, *what are* "the primitives" in the case of fence, offence and defence? Webster's dictionary gives the answer:

fend, the root of offend and defend;
fence, for etymology, see fend;

in other words, fend is the original word; and from it, in order, comes fence, offend, defend, offence, offensive, etc., defence, defensive, etc. So that, when Webster changed defence to defense, instead of conforming to his rule, that the spelling of the derivative must govern that of the primitive, he, in fact, and without knowing it, practically enacted a new rule, that the spelling of one derivative must govern the spelling of another derivative, whenever the lexicographer deemed it expedient. The remaining word of the "only three that remained" is pretence. Here, again, by parity of reasoning, the actual primitive is pretend; but, for the sake of the argument, let pretence be the primitive, and then consult Webster's dictionary:

pretense,
pretensed (authority, Encyc.),
pretension;

the primitive, pretence, is changed to conform to its two derivatives. But what sort of modern English word is pretensed? Webster cites the Encyclopœdia as authority. *What* Encyclopœdia? Rule out the word, for the present, as not sufficiently accredited, and there remains one primitive *vs.* one derivative—a tie vote. But this is not a fair statement on the part of Webster: he omits the familiar word pretentious. His dictionary, which "contains 16,000 more words than can be found in any previous dictionary," and which attains that distinction by recruits from all creditable and discreditable sources, nevertheless does not contain the word pretentious. Why? Did Webster omit that, and insert pretensed, in order to give "the derivatives" a uniformity of spelling and a majority of number? If so, the proceeding smacks strongly of *false* "pretences."

5, 6. Under rule number 3, Webster hunts down the "superfluous *l*" with the spirit of an exterminator; and in his preface, he still further hardens himself against *l*, by quoting a sneer from *Walker*: but Webster, under rule number 3, and Webster under rules 5 and 6, are two different men. The reasons given for adding an *l* to some words are quite as good as the reasons for taking it away from others; of which more anon. In the meantime, it is impossible not to suggest, in reference to the quotation from Walker (*vide* rule number 6), that as dulness should be written dullness, because its primitive is written dull, skilful should be written skillful, to "complete the analogy" with stiffness. An illustration, however, is a dangerous form of argument; it is very apt to prove too much; and those who resort to it in one case must submit to it in another. Apply this to rule number 5. "Distil, etc., should be written distill, because the derivatives, distiller, etc., require the *ll*": then certainly, forget, submit, begin, refer, concur, repel, and so on, should be written, forgett, submitt, beginn, referr, concurr, repell, and so on, because their derivatives require the final consonant to be doubled; as forgetting, submitting, beginning, referring, concurring, repelling. By the way, Webster's views of the powers of a lexicographer are pleasantly illustrated in a remark about Walker. Having quoted, in his preface, Walker's opinion on "the superfluous *l*," he says, "These were the deliberate opinions of Walker. If he had taken the trouble to carry them into his vocabulary, instead of relying on this mere remark for the correction of the error, probably, by this time, the error *would have been wholly eradicated from our orthography*."

7. Webster's manner of stating this rule leads the reader to suppose that befall, install, forestall, inthrall, miscall and enroll, are Webster's improvements on the previous spelling; but the last two, only, are his: and it is very odd that, when he become alive to the danger of mispronouncing enrol with one *l*, he should be so insensible to the same danger in control as to spell it with a single *l*; and that, too, while he spells the derivatives, controlling, etc., with the double *l*, in direct opposition to his own rule number 5.

8. "Mould and moult should be written mold and molt because the *u* was dropped or never was used in gold, bold, fold and colt." The reason is good; and its force may be shown, as in rule number 5, by carrying out the illustration: court should be written cort, "because the *u* has been dropped or never was used in" port and fort!

9. Webster found wo, go, so, no, without the *e*, and doe, foe, hoe, toe, with it. His reason for adding the *e* to wo, and for not adding it to go, so, no, is that wo is a noun, and the other three words are "other parts of speech." This is a small matter at best; but Webster's *reason* is entirely arbitrary.

10. Waiving the questions whether Milton is an authority for English orthography in the nineteenth century, and, if he is so, whether hight is not misprinted from his manuscript *per alium*, one question remains touching rule number 10, viz.: Is there any disputed point in ethics, morals, religion, astronomy, or nursery-rhymes, which may not be effectually disposed of by this universal solvent "*because*"? A word, however, as to Milton, on the questions waived. Webster cites a poet who died a century and a half before the "American Dictionary" was born, in support of the spelling of the single word hight. But surely, Milton, if an authority at all, cannot be restricted to one word; he must be presumed to have had a knowledge of orthography, generally, if he is permitted to dogmatise on it particularly; and if Webster accredits him as a standard, he must follow him as a standard. Turn, then, to the first edition of Paradise Lost. That may pretty safely be taken as an exponent of the poet's principle of English spelling—if, in his blindness, he had any. This edition, published in London, 1669, has, *passim*, the following specimens:

Som (some); rowled (rolled); shon (shone); tast (taste); fowl (foul); thir (their); justifie; defie; adversarie; progenie; alwaies; skie; appeer; neer; cleer; bindc; mankinde; wilde; waye; ruine; cherube; haire; paine; forme; eare; gulfe; rime; accoste; meeter; mee; hee; seveanth; warr; clann; kenn; farr; lyes; onely; desperat; supream; sollid, etc.

11. Webster does not say *why* "verbs from the Greek *izo* terminate in *ize*, as baptize," etc.; nor why "catechise and exorcise are exceptions." But the working of his rule, under which he changes defence to defense because defensive requires the *s*, seems to be impeded when applied to baptize, for he leaves it as he finds it, although he is compelled to spell its derivatives with an *s*—baptist, baptism, baptismal, etc. The assertion that baptize and legalize are "derived directly from the Greek" needs confirmation. Webster proceeds to say that "verbs and some nouns, derived from the French and elsewhere, have the termination in *ise*," and he furnishes a list of examples that professes to include the whole. The necessity for the remark and the citations is not very obvious; but it is strange that, with his propensity to "complete analogies," he should have omitted to include in his list the single and "only remaining" word, prize; certainly, on his own showing, this should be spelled prise.

It would seem, then, that Webster's much-vaunted reform is limited to about *eighty words* in a dictionary containing *eighty thousand* words; being the proportion of one to a thousand. A homœopathic quantity; yet, as the words victimized are those in common use, the minute dose has had a visible effect on the system. But the effect is not remedial. The patient is no better. English orthography has not been simplified, nor have its analogies been broadened by Webster's labours, even supposing his innovations had been accepted by scholars—which they have not. The dictionary may *sell*, but not for its orthography. The proprietors of a large publishing house, who are also publishers of the dictionary, have introduced Webster's spelling into their books, probably as a matter of contract; and some newspapers, to a greater or less extent, taken the same course. But these instances carry no authority on a purely literary question. Educated men and good writers, generally, have repudiated the experiment. And why should they not? The volunteer reformer was every way unequal to his task. He has given no good reason for any one change; and his changes, so far as adopted, have introduced confusion. His rules are ridiculous in themselves, irreconcileable with each other, and constantly at variance with his own practice. He changes a termination, or adds or take away a letter, because the primitive requires it—because the derivation requires it—because it endangers the pronunciation, when it does not—because it secures the pronunciation, when it does not—because the word is a noun—because it isn't a noun—because it is an exception—because it is so pronounced (by ignorant people)—because Milton spelled it so—in short, "because" *anything* that fits the caprice of the moment. Such advancing and retreating, such convolutions and involutions of reasoning, all for the sake of doing what never was done before, and all within the compass of eighty words—can find no precedent in the career of reforms.

And it is remarkable that Webster, with all his plodding, could not hit upon the really weak points of the language. He had the luck always to attack what was impregnable—at least to *his* assaults. There is no lack of inconsistencies in English orthography, but the instances that are least defensible are just those that Webster failed to discover. It may be well to designate a few specimens—not with the intention of urging a reform—Webster's experience in that line may well deter imitators; but—to show how obscure are obvious truths to a certain class of investigators.

To lead; to read; the preterite and past participle of these verbs are pronounced led and red, and yet are spelled led and read.

Use, abuse rise: the nouns and verbs have a uniform spelling; but the nouns are pronounced as uce and ice, and the verbs, uze and ize: yet advice and advise, with a similar difference of pronunciation, are spelled to conform to that difference. Again, refuse, surmise, etc., pronounce the *s* like *z*, in both the verb and the noun.

Few and view: why should not the spelling of these words be uniform?

Whole, in the adverb, drops the *e*, and becomes wholly; vile, in the adverb, retains the *e*, vilely.

Fascinate and vacillate: one with the *s* and the other without it: imitate and imminent; one with one *m*, and the other with two. These words follow their respective etymologies, but there are so many instances where etymology does not control orthography, it seems rather *Websterian* to give that as a reason for the difference.

Vermillion, pavilion, cotillion; all directly from the French, and all having the *ll* in the original, though only the last retains it.

Boot, root, foot, in the singular, change, in the plural, to boots, roots, feet.

Proffer and profit, with a singular etymology, are thus differently spelled.

Couple and supple, from the French couple and souple; etymology, in all respects, identical; and yet, though pronounced alike in English, are thus diversely spelled.

Episode and epitome, have the same etymology, yet one has three syllables, and the other four: this, however, is not a matter of spelling, but of pronunciation.

These are a few examples of *real* inconsistency in English orthography; but probably no man in his senses would undertake to reform them; the game would not pay for the candle.

COLERIDGE, THE BOY.—Hartley [Coleridge] is from home, visiting Mr. Wordsworth's sisters near Penrith. It is impossible to give you any adequate idea of his oddities; for he is the oddest of all God's creatures, and becomes quainter and quainter every day. It is not easy to conceive, what is perfectly true, that he is totally destitute of anything like modesty, yet without the slightest tinge of impudence in his nature. His religion makes one of the most humorous parts of his character. "I'm a boy of a very religious turn," he says; for he always talks of himself, and examines his own character, just as if he was speaking of another person, and as impartially. Every night he makes an extempore prayer aloud; but it is always in bed, and not till he is comfortable there and got into the mood. When he is ready, he touches Mrs. Wilson, who sleeps with him, and says, "Now listen!" and off he sets like a preacher. If he has been behaving amiss, away he goes for the Bible, and looks out for something appropriate to his case in the Psalms or the Book of Job. The other day, after he had been in a violent passion, he chose out a chapter against wrath. "Ah! that suits me!" The Bible also is resorted to whenever he ails anything, or else the Prayer-book. He once made a pun upon occasion of the bellyache, though I will not say that he designed it. "Oh, Mrs. Wilson, *I've* got the *colic!* read me the Epistle and Gospel for the day." In one part of his character he seems to me strikingly to resemble his father—in the affection he has for those who are present with him, and the little he cares about them when he is out of their sight. It is not possible for one human being to love another more dearly than Mrs. Wilson loves him, and he is as fond of her as it is in his nature to be of anything, and, probably, loves her better than he does anybody else. Last summer she was dangerously ill, and Hartley, in consequence, came and lived at home. He never manifested the slightest uneasiness or concern about her, nor ever would go near her. I do not know whether I should wish to have such a child or not. There is not the slightest evil in his disposition, but it wants something to make it steadily good; physically and morally there is a defect of courage. He is afraid of receiving pain to such a degree that, if any person begins to read a newspaper, he will leave the room, lest there should be anything shocking in it. This is the explication of his conduct during Mrs. Wilson's illness. He would not see her because it would give him pain; and when he was out of sight, he contrived to forget her. I fear that, if he lives, he will dream away life like his father, too much delighted with his own ideas ever to embody them, or suffer them, if he can help it, to be disturbed. I gave him 'Robinson Crusoe' two years ago. He never has read, nor will read, beyond Robinson's departure from the island. "No," he says; he does not care about him afterwards, and never will know. You will find infinite amusement from him when you come to visit us.—*Southey's Letters.*

WOMAN'S BILL OF RIGHTS.

THE state of the English law as regards women is, in many respects, no whit in advance of oriental selfishness. A woman is bought in the East (women are also bought every season in the West; in the barbarous regions of Belgravia and May-fair); and woman in the West, at least married woman, is almost as much the goods and chattels of the man who pays marriage fees for her as is the sack the property of Moslem husbands; the sack that makes so short and cheap a process of divorce, speeding down the flowing Bosphorus with poor Fatima, the inside passenger. In our Christian philanthropy, we have stopt the trade in Circassian girls, all of them with their black eyes turned towards Constantinople, their palpitating hearts stirred by the hopes of giving future Padishas to Stamboul. The price has, of course, gone down. Circassian girls—in the phrase of Manchester—have suffered a heavy decline. That is not the business of Christian England. Let Turks woo and wed decently, as of erst did Darby and Joan; and no longer have consigned to their arms a freight of affection, at so many piastres, with as much duty as possible included. Having, as we fondly hope, rebuked the Moslem into propriety, let us see that we have no flaw, no alloy in our own wedding-ring; let us examine whether the article is symbolic of equality, of never-ending love; or whether it is any other than a link to which the law gives man an invisible chain—none the weaker for its invisibility—holding to him his property.

A petition—it carries with it the names of many of the noblest women of England—women ennobled by their genius—a petition on this old despised matter of woman's rights is about to be presented to the Commons. The document is forthright, earnest, sensible. Xantippe has no scream in it: nor does that portentous person (born to boot-hooks and razors), the strong-minded woman, with a mission far deeper than wet-nursing, play Adam and Eve in her own person, Adam having considerably the worst of it. The petition practically deals with daily evils. The first we would dwell upon is the cowardly injustice that makes the virtuous, the suffering woman the property, in its most commercial sense, of the debauched or cruel husband. She can in no manner escape him. She may use her talents, her faculties; she may labour with her mind or with her hands, for self-support, and the support of her children, when the drunken husband, the wild human beast, the beast, be it remembered, justified by the law, seizes upon the produce of the woman's labour, and—like the strongest savage—makes it his own. It is impossible to forget how pathetically, how indignantly this injustice is branded upon society by Mrs. Norton, in her *Letter to the Queen*; a piece of writing in which every vital word throbbed like a pulse. With respect to the right of property to be held by women, the petition says:

"That whereas it is customary in manufacturing districts to employ women largely in the processes of trade, and as women are also engaged as sempstresses, laundresses, charwomen, and in other multifarious occupations which cannot here be enumerated, the question must be recognised by all as of practical importance."

Further:

"But that for the robbery by a man of his wife's hard earnings there is no redress—against the selfishness of a drunken father, who wrings from a mother her children's daily bread, there is no appeal. She may work from morning till night, to see the produce of her labour wrested from her and wasted in a gin palace; and such cases are within the knowledge of every one."

No appeal; none. The drudge is the man's property; she carries upon her finger, even as a purchased slave upon her neck, the symbol of his ownership. The woman has no appeal from such marital outrage; she is the brute's goods. The petition continues:

"That since modern civilization, in indefinitely extending the sphere of occupation for women, has in some measure broken down their pecuniary dependence upon men, it is time that legal protection be thrown over the produce of their labour, and that, in entering the state of marriage, they no longer pass from freedom into the condition of a slave, all whose earnings belong to his master and not to himself."

The produce of the woman's labour—the woman neglected, deserted by her husband save when he fitfully returns to her to rob her of what she has earned—must, by the sacredness of law, be assured her. We believe this to be the inevitable result of onward legislation; and this petition is but another step. And now, with respect to the husband; for our gentlewomen petitioners desire to be equitable.

"That there are certain portions of the law of husband and wife which bear unjustly on the husband, as, for instance, that of making him responsible for his wife's debts contracted *before marriage, even although he may have had no fortune with her*. Her power also, after marriage, of contracting debts in the name of her husband, for which he is responsible, is too unlimited, and often produces much injustice."

We fear that an alteration of the law in the matter of the spinster's debts must compel an alteration of the marriage-service. At least, by a pleasant fiction (amid the odour of orange-blossoms!) the bride becomes possessor of the bridegroom's fortune. He says solemnly, and at the time no doubt devotedly, "With all my worldly goods I thee endow." Thus, the bride's debts are clearly payable from the bride's means so fully and promptly acquired by gift so very handsomely made by the husband at the altar. This matter, we say, of ante-nuptial debt admits of nice discussion.

There is, moreover, a point omitted by the petitioners. A husband is not only answerable for his wife's debts, but for the use of his wife's parts of speech. If, in a too vivacious moment, Mrs. Smith should express her doubts of the honesty or chastity of Mrs. Jones, Smith the husband must pay the damages effected by Mrs. Smith's tongue. Now, this is a matter to be considered. Shall a husband still be liable, or—with an amended law—shall every scold abuse her neighbour upon her own responsibility, and at her own cost?

We are glad to find that the question as to the social condition of married women is fast ripening for discussion. At the last meeting of the Law Amendment Society—Lord Brougham, looking almost as young as Justice when she first came upon earth, in the chair—Lord Stanley earnestly dwelt upon the necessity of an "amendment of the laws relating to women"; the subject was further pursued by Sir Erskine Perry as to the well-known cruelty and cowardice of the law that exposed a woman to an agony worse than the sharpness of death, and the outraged victim helpless.

"In the action of crim. con. (said Sir Erskine), which was a scandal to civilization, the law of England denied to the wife the right of appearing to defend her reputation against what might be, perhaps, the attack of a malignant or designing husband (hear, hear). He earnestly hoped that these matters would be seriously taken up, and have the support of the Society."

We hopefully believe it. Our laws for women are a little too much of that poetically golden time when "wild in woods the noble savage ran." They still relish somewhat of the kraal and the club. Assuredly the first fault of Eve is a little harshly visited upon her married daughters. Eve may have first tempted Adam with the apple, but since then we have generally contrived to have the largest bite of it, and of the rosiest side, too, to ourselves. —*Lloyd's (London) Weekly.*

GRASS.—Consider what we owe merely to the meadow grass, to the covering of the dark ground by that glorious enamel, by the companies of those soft, and countless, and peaceful spears. The fields! Follow but forth for a little time the thoughts of all that we ought to recognise in those words. All spring and summer is in them—the walks by silent, scented paths—the rests in noonday heat—the joy of herds and flocks—the power of all shepherd life and meditation—the life of sunlight upon the world, falling in everal streaks, and falling in soft blue shadows, where else it would have struck upon the dark mould, or scorching dust—pastures beside the pacing brooks—soft banks and knolls of lowly hills—thymy slopes of down overlooked by the blue line of lifted sea—crisp lawns all dim with early dew, or smooth in evening warmth of barred sunshine, dinted by happy feet, and softening in their fall the sound of loving voices; all these are summed in those simple words; and these are not all. We may not measure to the full the depth of this heavenly gift, in our own land; though still, as we think of it longer, the infinite of that meadow sweetness, Shakspeare's peculiar joy, would open on us more and more, yet we have it but in part. Go out in the spring time, among the meadows that slope from the shores of the Swiss lakes to the roots of their lower mountains. There, mingled with the taller gentians and the white narcissus, the grass grows deep and free; and as you follow the winding mountain paths, beneath arching boughs all veiled and dim with blossom—paths that forever droop and rise over the green banks and mounds sweeping down in scented undulation, steep to the blue water, studded here and there with new-mown heaps, filling all the air with fainter sweetness—look up towards the higher hills, where the waves of everlasting green roll silently into their long inlets among the shadows of the pines; and we may, perhaps, at last know the meaning of those quiet words of the 147th Psalm, "He maketh grass to grow upon the mountains."

There are also several lessons symbolically connected with this subject, which we must not allow to escape us. Observe, the peculiar characters of the grass, which adapt it especially for the service of man, are its apparent *humility* and *cheerfulness*. Its humility, in that it seems created only for lowest service—appointed to be trodden on, and fed upon. Its cheerfulness, in that it seems to exult under all kinds of violence and suffering. You roll it, and it is stronger the next day; you mow it, and it multiplies its shoots, as if it were grateful; you tread upon it, and it only sends up richer perfume. Spring comes, and it rejoices with all the earth—glowing with variegated flame of flowers—waving in soft depth of fruitful strength. Winter comes, and, though it will not mock its fellow plants by growing then, it will not pine and mourn, and turn colourless or leafless as they. It is always green; and is only the brighter and gayer for the hoar-frost.—*Ruskin.*

SHAKSPEARE AND BEN JONSON.

ASSUME the time to have been 1615. Shakspeare was then fifty-one years of age (the fact that he was the elder of the two is apt to be forgotten); Jonson was forty-two. Glancing from the one to the other, one is struck, first of all, by the difference of their corporeal dimensions and proportions. Fuller must have had this partly in his eye when he hit on the comparison between the English man-of-war and the Spanish great galleon. The elder, Shakspeare, unless we greatly misinterpret all the contemporary allusions to him that remain, was not above the average size and weight of intellectual Englishmen—"a handsome, well-shaped man," says Aubrey; or, if the imagination insists on being still more literal, let us say, some five feet nine inches in height, and decidedly on this side of twelve stone in weight. Opposite to this model of courteous proportions, Ben, though nine years the junior, was a Colossus—height unknown, but presumably greater by an inch or two than Shakspeare's; and weight, if not yet actually twenty stone bating two pounds, which we know, on his own authority, it ultimately became, at least tending to that limit, by very visible effort at increased girth everywhere, but chiefly round the waist. In figure, indeed, and in gait when he walked, Ben Jonson was a kind of first edition of his namesake Samuel. Nor does the resemblance stop here. Like the Doctor, Ben was from his birth of a scorbutic constitution, and bore the marks of it about with him. In his youth his complexion had been tolerably clear and white, but, as he grew older, his irregular habits had produced their effects, and there had presented themselves on his face those seams and scars and blotches, which made it, according to all accounts, a face among ten thousand. One has only to look at the capital portrait of Jonson prefixed to Gifford's original edition of the poet's works, and then at any fair copy of the Stratford bust of Shakspeare, or of any of those portraits whose general resemblance to the bust attest their genuineness, to be able to fancy the difference of the heads and faces of the two men as answering to and completing the difference of their forms and figures. On the shoulders of Shakspeare we see that well-known head and face, so difficult accurately to describe, and yet so peculiar, with its general fulness and roundness of contour, its small individual features, its high forehead made still higher in appearance by being bald almost to the crown, its rich and placid expression, and its evident predominance of tissue over bone, of passive sensibility over active energy. One fancies the complexion fair rather than dark, or at least less inclining to dark than to fair. Look, again, at Jonson. The head seems bigger, the features are larger and coarser, the brow is more gnarled and corrugated, the hair seems to cling and curl about the head with a resolution to be stiff and grey rather than fall off, and the expression is altogether surly, rugged, defiant, fierce and active, rather than passive or impressible. One could anticipate, in a general way, how the two men would conduct themselves in conversation before they opened their lips. Jonson would be dogmatic, aggressive, controversial, blustering, and rude; Shakspeare, unless his face belied him, would be sympathetic, assisting, inventive, full of matter, gentle on the whole, and yet to be roused incredibly by a proper stimulus. Perhaps, however, while the two men were quiet, the bets would have been in favour of Jonson. As in the case of Lord Chancellor Thurlow, the feeling, in looking at his portentous face, would be that of wonder whether any man could possibly be so wise as that man looked: very likely, amid a company of strangers, it would be to his side of the table, and not to that where Shakspeare sat, that all eyes would be turned. But suppose the bets taken, and the combat about to begin. Lo! how big Ben, like the Spanish great galleon, heaves under way, how he rolls and swaggers, how he lays down the law very much as his ponderous namesake did afterwards in a different circle, how he laughs, and quotes, and brow-beats, and utters most furious wisdom, and only leaves off when there is enough of admiration to let him fall back triumphant upon the Canary. Shakspeare, meanwhile, has been listening to the rhinoceros with the most perfect enjoyment, and watching his face, and, whether agreeing with him or not, thinking him a most wonderful fellow in the main, and far more learned than himself. It is difficult to get Shakspeare into a controversy, but sometimes a word will be spoken on one side or the other, which leaves him no choice but to develope his own view of a subject in contradiction to Ben, or let Ben off with some roaring fallacy and the honours of the evening on account of it. Flesh and blood, even when they are the flesh and blood of a Shakspeare, cannot stand this; so have at you, Ben, for William